

The BULLETIN of Friends Historical Association

Vol. 45

Autumn Number, 1956

No. 2

CONTENTS

	Page
THE CONCEPT OF THE CHURCH IN SEVENTEENTH- CENTURY QUAKERISM (Part I) . . EMERSON W. SHIDELER	67
"SUCCESSORS OF WOOLMAN AND BENEZET":	
The Beginnings of the Philadelphia Friends Freedmen's Association YOURA QUALLS	82
BERNARD SHAW AND THE QUAKERS . . . WARREN S. SMITH	105
HISTORICAL NEWS	119
BOOK REVIEWS—	
Van Etten, <i>George Fox et les Quakers</i> . . . BLANCHE W. SHAFFER	120
Pomfret, <i>The Province of West Jersey</i> THOMAS E. DRAKE	120
Elbert Russell, <i>Quaker</i> HOWARD H. BRINTON	122
BRIEFER NOTICES HENRY J. CADBURY	124
ARTICLES IN QUAKER PERIODICALS LYMAN W. RILEY	127

Officers of Friends Historical Association

President: THOMAS E. DRAKE

Haverford College Library, Haverford, Pennsylvania

Vice Presidents: RICHMOND P. MILLER

C. MARSHALL TAYLOR

Secretary: SUSANNA SMEDLEY

Hildemere, Wawa, Pennsylvania

Treasurer: WILLIAM MINTZER WILLS

Merion Gardens, Merion Station, Pennsylvania

Curator: KATHARINE W. ELKINTON

6514 Germantown Avenue, Philadelphia 19

Assistant Curator

M. JOSEPH MCCOSKER, Atwater Kent Museum, Philadelphia 6

Editor of the Bulletin: FREDERICK B. TOLLES

Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania

Assistant Editor: ANNA B. HEWITT

Haverford College Library, Haverford, Pennsylvania

DIRECTORS

Elected at annual meetings held in 1953, 1954, and 1955

Term expires Eleventh Month 1956

Dorothy G. Harris

Lyman W. Riley

Horace Mather Lippincott

Susanna Smedley

William Mintzer Wills

Term expires Eleventh Month 1957

Richmond P. Miller

Edward E. Wildman

C. Marshall Taylor

H. Justice Williams

Term expires Eleventh Month 1958

Edwin B. Bronner

Henry J. Cadbury

Samuel J. Bunting, Jr.

Thomas E. Drake

George Vaux

The
BULLETIN
of
Friends
Historical Association

Vol. 45

Autumn Number, 1956

No. 2

**THE CONCEPT OF THE CHURCH IN
SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY QUAKERISM**

(PART I)

By EMERSON W. SHIDELER*

I

Christianity has always been identified with a visible body, the Church. Indeed the identification has been so close that to be a Christian has almost always meant that one must be a member of the Church. The injunction *extra ecclesiam nulla salus est*, there is no salvation outside the church, puts this identification as an absolute claim. Inevitably then the nature of the Church becomes a fundamental issue in Christian history and thought, for through this definition one in fact states his concept of what Christianity is and what it means to be a Christian.

The two extreme approaches to this problem are obvious enough. The one identifies a specific institution or doctrinal formula or tradition as the authentic Church, thus providing a clear and definitive criterion by which to separate the sheep from the goats. The creeds of Christendom were written to provide just such a criterion of authenticity. The other extreme rejects the notion of an embodiment of Christianity in some visible form to

* Emerson W. Shideler, a former student at Pendle Hill, is Associate Professor in the Department of History, Government, and Philosophy at Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

say instead that the whole matter is one of internal attitude and guidance. If this leads to association with others and in extreme cases organization, still these are wholly derivative, contingent upon inner spiritual states and without authority or competence to guide or check those inner spiritual states.

The Society of Friends has generally been understood to hold the latter position, either as an explicit claim, or implicitly in its failure to accept the title Church for the Society or to practice the usual sacraments associated with Church membership. In fact, however, a careful examination of the writings of the formative period before 1700 shows that the weighty opinion of the growing movement clearly saw the dangers in this position and rejected it. During the same period, as customary procedures crystallized into established organizations carrying the life of the Society, the early Friends also saw the dangers of falling into the extreme externalized definition while trying to escape the threat of its opposite.

The problem represented by these polar extremes can never be permanently solved. On the one hand, he who speaks in the name of inward leading threatens the stability of existing structures and the values they sustain. On the other side, the very notion of structure and organization restricts individual and inward leading to the channels already provided by the organizational pattern. So long as resolution in principle must also be resolution in practice every generation of Christians and every agency of Christendom must struggle with the paradox in its own terms. Past solutions are not *a priori* solutions for present issues, and particularly not for the Society of Friends if it is to remain consistent with its own heritage. But perhaps consistency with the past is itself an affirmation of one alternative over the other. Yet a re-examination of the formative period in terms of this issue may give light also for the present in planning for the future.

In part the typical identification of Quakerism with an inward, individual, and non-institutional view of the Church arises from the mystical dimension in both Quaker preaching and experience. But in part also it arises from a failure to take due account of the total context of the times, which provided a people who were not only spiritually awakened but also religiously in-

formed about the Bible and Christian history, and who took for granted the fact that true Christians would gather together into societies. Hence the First Publishers of Truth¹ were not, in our sense of the term, organizers. They called people to respond to that witness of God already in their hearts. But when people did respond to that witness, thus knowing Christ within, something happened to them to make their lives utterly different, bringing them into a totally new relationship with other people. In part, of course, the new relationship with other people arose from the change within themselves: since they had now a different center around which their lives were oriented, other people appeared different, allowing them to build new relationships. But that was only part of the story. On that basis the group would be a purely derived thing. Deeper than this, as each person felt the Spirit of God transforming his heart, he was enabled to discern the same Spirit working in the hearts of the others, so that in a very real sense the same Spirit working in all brought them all into organic relationship with one another, which was more than simply the summation of a collection of changed persons.²

The main weight of early Quakerism thus cannot be understood in purely individualistic terms without ignoring the total environment of the times and without rejecting their own clear emphasis on the integrity of the group in the presence of disruptive forces in their own midst.

The seventeenth-century Quaker doctrine of the Church is then first a proclamation of the necessity for inner illumination within the context of the Christian fellowship. Seventeenth-century Quaker doctrine is secondly in practice an attempt to evolve a structure which could carry the life of the Society while encouraging the inner illumination which gave veracity and validity to the organized life of the Society. Each of the leaders to be examined struggled with both theory and practice.

¹ A term applied to the company of George Fox's companions who spread the Quaker message across England. The stories of their work in founding Quaker groups, collected by the Meeting for Sufferings of London Yearly Meeting, have been edited from the manuscript accounts by Norman Penney, and published under the title "*The First Publishers of Truth*" (London, 1907).

² Howard H. Brinton, *Creative Worship* (London, 1931), pp. 31, 46.

II. GEORGE FOX'S CONCEPT OF THE CHURCH

George Fox did not directly expound the meaning of the term Church, although he used it frequently. He found it in his religious environment; he found institutions around him calling themselves Churches which failed to give him what he expected from the community of Christians. When, in his basic concern for inward religious experience,³ he used the term in what he considered its true sense, he opposed all efforts to make of the Church an external, physical, institutional thing, itself the criterion of true Christianity.⁴ The Church for Fox meant people, but people who had come into such a relationship with God through the Christ within that their own persons were temples of God and his dwelling place,⁵ with Christ as their head.⁶ Their relationship was visible as well as spiritual, as they came together in meetings apart from the established institution.⁷ Wherever two or three gathered in the name of Christ, regardless of circumstances and even in prison, there was the Church.⁸

More than physical assembly was required; those who were together were to feel the active presence of Christ in their midst as their bishop, preserving them in the light and exercising his offices in their hearts.⁹ Hence the Church did not include all persons, only those who had been reborn,¹⁰ but all who had been born again, thus possessing the new covenant in Christ Jesus, were of the Church.¹¹ Thus Fox eliminated the idea that the Church could be an institution including some who were not in his sense

³ Fox, *Gospel-Truth Demonstrated* (London, 1706), pp. 24, 903.

⁴ *The Journal of George Fox*, ed. Norman Penney (Cambridge, 1911 [this edition is commonly referred to as the "Cambridge Journal" and is hereafter cited as *CJ*]), I, 27, 56-57; II, 99, 130-32; *The Works of George Fox* (Philadelphia, 1831), III, 348; *Gospel-Truth*, pp. 24, 903.

⁵ *CJ*, I, 27, 56-57.

⁶ *CJ*, I, 56-57; II, 99; *Works*, III, 348.

⁷ *CJ*, I, 56-57.

⁸ *Works*, III, 435; VIII, 197.

⁹ *Ibid.*, VIII, 197.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, III, 41.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, III, 58.

of the term saved. All, then, who would belong to the true Church must repent, amend their lives, and give themselves wholly to guidance through the Light, for there was no other pathway to the Church.¹²

Fox had a strong feeling of identification between the members of the Church and Christ, as expressed in his frequent designation of Christ as head of the body. This he called a mystery, that those of the Church "are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones . . ."¹³ and they are as nigh together as husband and wife."¹⁴ The Church was founded upon no external basis, such as the idea of Peter as the Rock, but upon Christ, inwardly known as the true Rock and foundation.¹⁵ Those who had this truth were living stones of the true Church.¹⁶ They knew and saw and were members of the body of Christ, the Church.¹⁷ The power of God, the Gospel, built the believers, the living stones, up into a spiritual household, the fellowship of the gospel, the Church.¹⁸ In an early epistle, Fox brought these ideas together in an exhortation to the Friends to be faithful to the power of God within them, through which life, hope, fellowship with God and with one another were communicated to them, and in which they were kept free from taint of sin.

So live in life, and the love, and the power of God, which was before man and woman fell; in that power ye are kept over all outward things, that have been set up, and are set up in the fall, which cause pride, and contention and strife; which, if lived in, keeps out of the power, in which is the saints' everlasting fellowship, that stands and remains, and is everlasting, for ever and ever. In which power the living seed lives, and the living babes are preserved; in which power they have their food from the God of life, which is living, which nourishes the immortal babes up to the immortal God, with the immortal food; through which they come to be the living stones, that build up the spiritual household, who are the church in God; who are brought out of the state, where Adam and Eve with their sons and daughters are drove from God, up to God again by Christ, the power

¹² Ibid., III, 473.

¹³ *Works*, III, 593.

¹⁴ Ibid., III, 49.

¹⁵ *Gospel-Truth*, p. 999.

¹⁶ *Works*, III, 349-50.

¹⁷ Ibid., III, 51.

¹⁸ Ibid., VII, 227-29.

of God, who is the way to God, where the church is in God, that is the pillar and ground of truth. In that power, (as I said before,) ye will have an everlasting fellowship with God, and one with another, which power of God was before the fall was. In that power ye will know one another, and see one another, in which ye shall ever be together; in which ye shall see and know your election before the world began. So farewell.¹⁹

There could be no true Church except where Christ was known to be the guiding Light of life, exercising his offices, and "the true marriage to Christ the heavenly man is witnessed by such as are flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone," by coming to the Light, knowing the Spirit of Christ within.²⁰ All, then, who lived contrary to the Light had no share in the experience of identification with Christ, knew nothing of the quality of life he could have given them, and were outside the fellowship of those who did know the joy of Christ within.²¹

None could come into the Church except they heard the voice of God and knew him drawing them to himself.²² It was in this way, as they responded to the Light, that they became Children of the Light, were so grafted into Christ and made the spiritual household, the Church of which Christ is head.²³ Christ alone had been the Quakers' "first speaker," through whom God had taught them and made them disciples, the true Church of which Christ is head.²⁴ Christ was the common element binding all together into one relationship as the Light became the basis by which each lived.²⁵

And all ye Friends, that wait in that which is pure in itself, which cannot lie, which doth not change, wait upon God, for God doth not change, and let all flesh be silent before the Lord, that the life may speak in all; then the mouth of the Lord is known, and God is exalted and glorified with his own work, which he brings forth. And meet together therein everywhere, and mind that which gathers you, and wait on that which is pure which gathers you out of the world's nature, disposition, conversation, churches, formes, and customs, which will knit your hearts together

¹⁹ Ibid., VII, 75

²⁰ Ibid., VII, 243-44.

²¹ *Gospel-Truth*, pp. 971-72.

²² *Works*, III, 451.

²³ *Gospel-Truth*, pp. 1014-15.

²⁴ *CJ*, II, 345-46.

²⁵ *Gospel-Truth*, pp. 586-87.

up to God. That which gathers you out of all these is the spirit of the Lord, which will gather you up to him, who is the Father of spirits; that ye may be able to judge, and discern, and confound all the deceit in the world, and grow up to be as kings, and suffer nothing to reign in you but what is in the life eternal.²⁶

Not only among Friends was the Spirit of God, the Light, working, but all over the world wherever people would respond to give their lives into God's guidance, they would likewise be gathered into the fellowship which united people with one another and with God.²⁷ Thus the reality of the fellowship experience was not made dependent upon face-to-face contacts, but was felt through the workings of the power of God active in all the members of the fellowship.

For George Fox the Church was two things at once. In the first place, the church was those people who had been reborn through the power of God, the Christ within, "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood,"²⁸ called by God among every nation upon earth. As such, the Church stood in contrast to all attempts to confine it within a definition or in the historical institutions. In the second place, underlying the Church idea there was the vivid experience and resulting certainty of direct, immediate God-relationship on the part of each one who thus belonged to the Church, and the equally vivid sense of fellowship with all the others who had had the same experience of God. The Church was not only the communion of saints in idea; it was the communion of saints in fact, in everyday experience, communion of the saints with God and with each other, and Fox tended to blend both aspects in speaking of the Quakers.

In speaking of the Church, Fox tended to use the term as a name for the new group relationship with God existing through his power in the heart, rather than using it to define an institution existing among men. He did not make the word an individualistic one by saying that where one person found God's power working in his heart, there was the Church. He always used it to describe the social context of the individual experience of God, but he refrained from describing the Church in external terms which would

²⁶ *Works*, VII, 53.

²⁷ *Gospel-Truth*, p. 175.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 443.

make it an objective fact apart from the active sense of communion within the fellowship. It is this fact which makes such descriptions as God dwelling within the members who are the temples of God, or the marriage between Christ and the Church, really attempts to describe the experience of the participants rather than the objective, externalized indications of the limits of the church group. Whatever limit the church group had was determined by the extent of the activity of God's Spirit; the limits were not dependent upon definition, for that would return to the externalism Fox was most concerned to attack.

III. BARCLAY'S THEOLOGICAL FORMULATION

Robert Barclay moved in a different atmosphere from George Fox. He set forth his concept of the Church in somewhat similar terms, but in a much more formal fashion and with greater care for precision. He described an existing institution rather than, as Fox did, an experience.

The Church was that company of people whom God had called out of the world and its spirit to live by his Light and power. As the Church catholic it comprehended those thus called by God now living and those who had gone to their reward.²⁹ Out of this Church there was no salvation, but for Barclay that was simply a matter of definition, not of institutional authority or validity, for outside the call of God, inwardly apprehended as obedience to the Light, there was no salvation. The same qualification determined both salvation and membership in the Church.³⁰ More important, he felt that the catholic character of the Church derived from the universal activity of the Light, by which members could be called into the Church from every human group whether of the Christian tradition or not, as they rejected their sin and embraced the righteousness opened to them. In this sense the Church existed in all generations, for God has never lacked witnesses to his truth.³¹

²⁹ *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity* (Philadelphia: Friends Book Association, n. d.), p. 258.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 258-59.

³¹ *Ibid.*

To be a member then of the Catholic church, there is need of the inward calling of God by his light in the heart, and a being leavened into the nature and spirit of it, so as to forsake unrighteousness, and to be turned to righteousness, and in the inwardness of the mind, to be cut out of the wild olive tree of our own first fallen nature, and ingrafted into Christ by his Word and Spirit in the heart. And this may be done in those who are strangers to the history, God not having pleased to make them partakers thereof. . . .³²

The catholic Church was essentially invisible insofar as it was based upon relationship to God through the Light for its existence, with no outward profession necessary for membership in this Church universal. When, however, the Church universal was particularized into a gathering of people, a like profession of faith with the others was necessary for membership in that particular gathering.³³

The Church was more than a term synonymous with Christianity, embracing all who had followed the Light within every age. Barclay thought of the Church as the gathering of these people into a body,³⁴ but without making of that gathering an external and historical institution which could have an existence apart from the true believers actually brought together in any one place.³⁵ Wherever the Light was rejected, by that much the Church ceased to exist. Actually, the Church existed only when and where true followers of the Light were gathered into one body.³⁶ Barclay was discussing no general idea or vague label for all Christians, under the term Church, but the association of true Christians together into one group.

In his *Anarchy of the Ranters* Barclay made the matter still more explicit because here he was concerned with a specific problem arising within the gathered group. The Church of Christ, he said in the summary, now in its visible form consisted of a group of people sanctified by God's Spirit, united in certain principles of belief and action, having a certain order of government, for, he

³² Ibid., p. 260.

³³ Ibid., a point he elaborated in *The Anarchy of the Ranters*.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 270.

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 272-73.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 271.

says, "I speak not here of the church in the dark night of apostacy, that consisted not of any society visibly united."³⁷

Barclay emphasized that this group was gathered together in unanimity in certain principles of religion, faith, and practice, which distinguished them from other groups. It was this outward profession of faith, the force of truth alone, which constituted the visible bond of their fellowship distinguishing them from others.

Now I say, we being gathered together into the belief of certain principles and doctrines, without any constraint or worldly respect, but by the mere force of truth upon our understanding, and its power and influence upon hearts, these principles and doctrines, and the practices necessarily depending upon them are, as it were, the terms, that have drawn us together, and the bond, by which we became centered into one body and fellowship, and distinguished from others.³⁸

Barclay's emphasis here was to reinforce the authority of the Society to govern its life. In later times, however, notably in the period of the Separations, his position was reinterpreted to make doctrine the actual bond of the Church, and conformity necessary to membership.³⁹ The characteristics of those distinguishing features would set the true Church apart from those pretending to that title.

Now the way to distinguish that church, gathering, or assembly of people, whereof Christ truly is the head, from such as falsely pretend thereto, is by considering the principles and grounds upon which they are gathered together, the nature of that hierarchy and order they have among themselves, the way and method they take to uphold it, and the bottom upon which it standeth; which will greatly contribute to clear all mistakes.⁴⁰

At the same time he withdrew from absolutely identifying any given visible body of persons as the Church, as having all the

³⁷ *Truth Triumphant, Through the Spiritual Warfare, Christian Labours, and Writings, of that Able and Faithful Servant of Jesus Christ, Robert Barclay* (Philadelphia, 1831), I, 353.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, I, 512-13.

³⁹ E. g. John Wilbur, in *A Narrative and Exposition of the Late Proceedings of New England Yearly Meeting* (New York, 1845), pp. 143-46, appeals to Barclay against J. J. Gurney. Also *A Letter from Anna Braithwaite, to Elias Hicks on the Nature of His Doctrines* (Philadelphia, 1825) appeals to the same passage against Elias Hicks.

⁴⁰ Barclay, *Truth Triumphant*, I, 493.

attributes of the presence within of the Spirit, particularly infallibility of judgment. The Church was to be thought of as those who "truly and really have received and hold the truth as it is in Jesus, and are in measure sanctified, or sanctifying in and by the power and virtue thereof, working in their inward parts: and this may be made up of divers distinct gatherings or churches in several countries or nations."⁴¹

Basically Barclay derived his concept of the Church from the inner experience of God, sanctification and rebirth of each person, but he brought these together into a visible company of people with similar beliefs and practices which identified them as distinct from other groups of people. The bond between them was not only their identity of experience of God, but their unanimity in expressing that experience in words, behavior, and intentions, which entrusted to the Church "a certain care and oversight over one another,"⁴² so as to prevent occasions that might interrupt or hinder the common interest. Hence, Barclay made specific a group consciousness based upon the visible fruits of the Spirit within, in contrast to Fox, who felt that the experience of the Spirit was itself the mark of unity. However, Barclay was not attempting to establish a basis for an externalized system of church government; he was confronted with the fact that a feeling of unity and fellowship could not be maintained unless the group had some power to keep the whole company moving together.

IV. FELLOWSHIP: DEWSBURY, HOWGIL, PENINGTON

William Dewsbury seemed to have little concern to make the Church an institution. For him the company of God's people was a fellowship of those called out of the world to live purged and regenerated lives by the power of God's Spirit working within them. By that Spirit they would be bound to God and to one another so that the Lord and his people were to be one.⁴³ Rather

⁴¹ Ibid., I, 537.

⁴² Ibid., I, 493.

⁴³ *The Faithful Testimony of that Antient Servant of the Lord and Minister of the Everlasting Gospel William Dewsbury* (London, 1689), pp. 92-93.

than a formal definition of the Church, Dewsbury intended his words to be a declaration of comfort to the oppressed who suffered for their faith.

Francis Howgil based his concept of the Church upon the experience out of which he felt the group life of Christianity had grown. In apostolic times the Spirit of truth from God came into the hearts of the believers to make known to them all mysteries and lead them into truth. This same Spirit today, he felt, brought salvation and united them into one body in which through the Spirit they were of one heart and one mind and knew the Spirit of God to be within them, the Christ within, their sanctification and justification.

And so they knew one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Faith, one Hope, one Baptism, the one Spirit into which they were all baptized, into which they all did drink, by which all that did believe were sanctified, and did receive the Inheritance among the Saints in Light; and this was the Church that was in God, which was begotten by God the Father, and preserved in Christ Jesus, in the lively Faith, and in the lively Hope, by which their Souls were anchored, and they established in the Truth, that made free, and they had received the Spirit of Prophecy, and did speak one by one, according to the Revelation of the Spirit (which led out of Confusion into Order) and they being in the Power of God, did walk by its Order, in the Order of the Gospel.⁴⁴

Howgil was here describing not a theory of the Church, but the experience of union with God through Christ within which bound man to God and man to man. Those were of the true Church who came to know Christ, the Truth, ruling in their hearts.⁴⁵ So today, he said, only the power of God working in the hearts of those who wait for him was sufficient to restore people to fellowship with God and with each other in the true Church. The Quakers had been brought forth to witness to this fact, the brightness of the glory of God as it had been known in the beginning.⁴⁶ To see that Church, one must have his earthly eye put out, his worldly wisdom confounded, and all control over life given to the power and Spirit of God. Those who thus had their lives re-

⁴⁴ Howgil, *The Dawnings of the Gospel-Day, and Its Light and Glory Discovered* (London, 1676), p. 148.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 386.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 423.

newed and controlled by God would see the Church, and were the one body of which Christ was the head, by whom they were all knit together in one faith.⁴⁷ The essential qualification for membership in the Church was the guiding and controlling presence of Christ within, and he considered the Church to exist wherever such are to be found even if dispersed through the world.⁴⁸

Howgil refused to give the term to buildings or institutional procedures. The Church was the people led by God's Spirit, hence whenever two or three were gathered in Christ's name, and he was in their midst, there was the Church. He insisted at his trial that the Quakers did not desert the Church by going to their own meetings in homes, for it was not to be confined to a place or a building, but belonged to those who were in fellowship through Christ.⁴⁹ For Howgil the reality of the Church consisted in the experience of sharing with other people a common experience of guidance by the Light within. He had little institutional concern, and the mission of the Quaker group was not to bring members into their own society as an organization, but to call men to the truth that they might know the same experience out of which Christianity came.

Isaac Penington, like Fox, understood the Church to be a gathering of people in the Spirit of God,⁵⁰ a spiritual body gathered out of the world and its nature into God's power, to live by his Spirit within them, filled with the glory of his presence within. It was not profession of the truth which made a true Church, Penington said, but union with the truth, living by the power of that which was professed.⁵¹ He changed the figure to the "Spirit and power of the Lord Jesus Christ,"⁵² still designating the Church as those who have received through him life and power, "a company of living stones, who have received life from him, the foundation stone; and meet together to wait upon and worship

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 648.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 617.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ *The Works of Isaac Penington* (Sherwoods, N.Y., 1861-63), IV, 56, 375-76.

⁵¹ Ibid., II, 477.

⁵² Ibid., III, 310.

the Father, in the light and Spirit which they have received from him."⁵³ They were cut off from the old life, given a new nature by Christ's baptism with fire and his Spirit, thus brought together into one body fitted for Christ to head.⁵⁴ However, the gathering was not a dramatic or impressive or overwhelming event. On the contrary, God worked through the witness of himself put into the heart of each, which would appear to the eyes of the world mean and insignificant, even contemptible. But those who responded to it would be gathered together into the Church.⁵⁵ Pennington was concerned here not so much to describe the objective nature of God's working as to warn his readers against mistaking the experience of God's leading because they applied the wrong criteria.

The Church would continue its status as a true Church so long as the members remained under the power that gathered them, so long as they remained in union with the Spirit of God which first gave them their being.⁵⁶ There was always the possibility that the Church would depart from the Spirit and be scattered as it wandered into corrupt doctrine and practices and lost the faith.⁵⁷

Pennington's concept of the Church was as a reality first in the experience of the people who knew Christ within, and the ensuing fellowship with one another; secondly it was a definition. The basis was a strong sense of union, of the Church as the spiritual body of Christ, the spouse, of which Christ was the husband, the living head of a living body.⁵⁸ The basic reality constituting the Church was the power of God working in the lives of men. Hence no outward practice could constitute the Church or make one a member, only divine reality inwardly apprehended which made Christ the king of life, could gather the Church. Wherever such people were to be found as fruits of the working of Christ's Spirit, there the Church existed.⁵⁹

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid., III, 109-10.

⁵⁵ Ibid., III, 182-83.

⁵⁶ Ibid., II, 478-79.

⁵⁷ Ibid., III, 112.

⁵⁸ Ibid., IV, 8-9. II, 306-7.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

Their experience had been that as they waited for God's Spirit to come in and take possession of their lives, that same Spirit brought them together into fellowship and union as the Church.⁶⁰ When Penington spoke of the fellowship of the saints, he was referring not to the external association of like minds, but to the inward bonds existing in the inner life through the same Spirit controlling the lives of all. Only in the power of the Spirit and under its leading would there be meeting together in fellowship or in worship. External relationships or physical assembly had no part in the character of the true Church fellowship.⁶¹

Penington was explicit in his emphasis upon the spiritual nature of the Church. It derived its existence from the power of God working among men and existed whenever and wherever God's power worked in the hearts of men, and existed nowhere else. In pure theory this would be an impossible definition of the Church, for it excludes all external limits upon its extent among men. But it does represent the experience of the Quakers which Penington attempted to depict. Those who knew the power of God, the Christ within, to be the basis of their own lives, knew at the same time a real fellowship with others who shared their experience. They knew a fellowship they could recognize, participate in, and rejoice in because the bond which held them together was the Spirit of God.

⁶⁰ Ibid., II, 308.

⁶¹ Ibid., III, 341-42.

(To be concluded)

"SUCCESSORS OF WOOLMAN AND BENEZET": THE BEGINNINGS OF THE PHILADELPHIA FRIENDS FREEDMEN'S ASSOCIATION

By YOURA QUALLS*

On the tenth of Eleventh Month, 1863, five days after the organization of the Association of Friends of Philadelphia and its Vicinity for the Relief of Colored Freedmen (the Friends Freedmen's Association), its founders issued "An Appeal to Friends and Others in Behalf of the Destitute Freedmen of the South," picturing the plight of these refugees from civil strife: "Singly and in families, by tens and hundreds, they have come within the lines of our armies, until they now number nearly two hundred thousand souls. Crushed and dispirited by long years of oppression, they know not how to supply their simplest wants, and without instruction and encouragement, their case will be pitiable indeed."¹

The Appeal asked Quakers: "Shall we not give of our abundance to relieve the wants of these suffering men? As unwilling participants in the sin of Slavery," it went on, "let us not forget that we owe . . . [Negro refugees] a debt incurred by using the products of their unrequited toil. As a religious body, our faith impels us to listen to their cry. As a Society, we are traditionally reminded that our fathers first gave this race the boon of freedom, and taught them to look to us for succor. Let them not look in vain."

*Youra Qualls is a member of the Department of English, Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

¹Copy of Appeal in Manuscript Minutes, Executive Committee, Association of Friends of Philadelphia and Its Vicinity for the Relief of Colored Freedmen, Eleventh Month 10, 1863. Records of the Friends Freedmen's Association, consisting of minute books, cash books, committee reports, letters, and the yearly printed reports of the Association, are the major sources used for this study. The records are housed in the archives of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 302 Arch Street, Philadelphia.

The Friend on Eleventh Month 21, 1863, published the Appeal, making the following editorial comment:

. . . particularly to us, the successors of Woolman and Benezet, this charity should recommend itself with special weight. They labored with a purity of purpose and sacrifice of self rarely exhibited in their day and accomplished much for the amelioration of the slaves' condition. . . . Providence in punishing the cruelties of the oppressor, is also letting the oppressed go free; and it is now for us to prove the value of our often reiterated expressions of sympathy by entering at once heartily into this field of labour which lies so manifest before us.

I

Was contribution to the relief of 200,000 refugees from bondage the whole of the antislavery testimony for the successors of Woolman and Benezet? Quakers had always assisted in the relief of temporary distress resulting from such catastrophes as war. They had traditionally assumed guardianship of their manumitted slaves, finding employment for them, and founding schools for their children. Hitherto freedmen had learned to live quiet in the land, mainly in the communities where they had been freed, eking out an existence in spite of prejudice and anti-Negro laws. The prospect of four million ex-slaves struggling for survival and economic and social security might well be overwhelming to even such seasoned philanthropists as the Friends. Such a prospect called for enlarging the basic principle of the antislavery testimony, i.e., release from physical bondage for all God's children, to comprehend the perennial enemies of freedom during the rapidly succeeding phases of war, emancipation, and reconstruction. In antebellum times such bondage had been the major foe; during the first year of the Civil War physical chains were falling away, but the outlook for the freedman's future was dark. For centuries prejudice against the Negro had been legislated into the statutes of nearly all states so that special laws, customs, and codes debarred him, even when free, from both skilled labor and the professions and in most communities denied him equal educational facilities. Thus both Jim Crow laws and disfranchisement worked their ill effects throughout the land, producing—in the favorite adjective of the times—a "degraded" race of people. As the Civil War swelled to a climax, statesmen argued what to do with the

degraded race and could only propose that as fast as war freed them they should be deported. An ancient proposal: for over fifty years both statesmen and philanthropists had been promoting schemes for sending the Negro population far from the old folks at home.

Considering the situation, Friends of the Civil War era could conclude that their wartime testimony against slavery must reflect their stand against such foes of freedom as Jim Crow laws, exclusion statutes, disfranchisement, and deportation schemes. The war generation of Quakers, heirs of Woolman and Benezet, had clear and forthright statements to make regarding enemies bred and nourished by prejudice. What they had to say in the press, letters, and reports of their journeys into the South formed the basis for their efforts to relieve the distressed and to contribute to their mental and moral uplift through freedmen's aid associations. All that they said and did tells a familiar story, but it is told against the background of a civil strife which brought sufferings to the peaceable Friends even as it brought them into a kind of golden age of humanitarian endeavor for a people first freed by them.

Commenting upon the constitutional acts of Ohio and Illinois to exclude Negroes and upon such legislation proposed in Pennsylvania, *The Friend* on the fourteenth of Second Month, 1863, said that such an act ill became the great and humane state of Pennsylvania, which had taken the lead in progressive, enlightened legislation for its colored citizens. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting sent a vigorous "Remonstrance of the Religious Society of Friends Against Prohibiting the Immigration of Colored People" to the Senate and House of Representatives of Pennsylvania. During the debate *The Friend* said that such a law for Pennsylvania would be "a retrograde movement, offensive to the progressive civilization of the age, to the liberal principles of Christian philanthropy, and receding towards the bigotry and prejudices of the dark periods of ignorance and cruelty." Also, it was a clear violation of Christian doctrine: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye also even so unto them." Designers of the bill should think of its repressive provisions working against them. How would they like to be deprived of the privilege of visiting friends and relatives, of comforting the ill,

of paying final offices of respect to the dead? The proposed exclusion act failed to pass the state legislature. Quaker periodicals continued to denounce exclusion laws and to call upon Christians to assist in removing the stigma of inferiority from black men, to strive to secure for them equality of rights, and to help them gain an economic foothold as free men.²

An editorial in *The Friend*, Seventh Month 26, 1862, roundly flayed the operation of race prejudice as manifested in Congressional debate of general emancipation in the border states. It seemed to the Quaker editor that if the emancipation measures arose solely from political motives and the hope of injuring the rebels, while the hearts of the people were still filled with hate or ill will to the slave because of his dark skin and supposed inferiority, then perhaps "defeat and disaster" would attend efforts to suppress the rebellion. The lesson of the war was to teach the people that they were "no better in the Divine sight than those they have so unjustly despised and injured" and that Americans must become willing to recognize the Negroes' claims as fellow men by admitting them "to an equal share in the rights and privileges which the government confers."

Quakers had repudiated colonization schemes long before the war had forced attention to the Negro's future.³ In the war period they denounced colonization as impracticable and un-Christian. A year before the founding of the Friends Freedmen's Association, their stand on deportation was given by *The Friend*.⁴

²Articles appeared, for example, in the following: *The Friend*, Twelfth Month 13, 1862, Twelfth Month 26, 1863, Fourth Month 2, 1864; *The Friends' Review*, Fourth Month 5, 1862, Seventh Month 26, 1862; and *The Freedman's Friend*, Seventh Month, 1864, and Tenth Month, 1864.

³The Friends had condemned colonization as "the unrighteous work of expatriation" in the period of the greatest success of the American Colonization Society, the decade of the 1840's. Harlow Lindley, "The Anti-Slavery Separation in Indiana and the 'Henry Clay Incident,'" *BULLETIN OF FRIENDS HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION*, VI (1915), 34.

⁴*The Friend*, Twelfth Month 13, 1862. Earlier (Second Month 23, 1861), *The Friends' Review* had carried an editorial, "The New Home for the Negro," which observed that Great Britain was successfully experimenting with cotton growing on the West Coast of Africa. It called attention to a new English organization, the African Aid Society headed

degraded race and could only propose that as fast as war freed them they should be deported. An ancient proposal: for over fifty years both statesmen and philanthropists had been promoting schemes for sending the Negro population far from the old folks at home.

Considering the situation, Friends of the Civil War era could conclude that their wartime testimony against slavery must reflect their stand against such foes of freedom as Jim Crow laws, exclusion statutes, disfranchisement, and deportation schemes. The war generation of Quakers, heirs of Woolman and Benezet, had clear and forthright statements to make regarding enemies bred and nourished by prejudice. What they had to say in the press, letters, and reports of their journeys into the South formed the basis for their efforts to relieve the distressed and to contribute to their mental and moral uplift through freedmen's aid associations. All that they said and did tells a familiar story, but it is told against the background of a civil strife which brought sufferings to the peaceable Friends even as it brought them into a kind of golden age of humanitarian endeavor for a people first freed by them.

Commenting upon the constitutional acts of Ohio and Illinois to exclude Negroes and upon such legislation proposed in Pennsylvania, *The Friend* on the fourteenth of Second Month, 1863, said that such an act ill became the great and humane state of Pennsylvania, which had taken the lead in progressive, enlightened legislation for its colored citizens. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting sent a vigorous "Remonstrance of the Religious Society of Friends Against Prohibiting the Immigration of Colored People" to the Senate and House of Representatives of Pennsylvania. During the debate *The Friend* said that such a law for Pennsylvania would be "a retrograde movement, offensive to the progressive civilization of the age, to the liberal principles of Christian philanthropy, and receding towards the bigotry and prejudices of the dark periods of ignorance and cruelty." Also, it was a clear violation of Christian doctrine: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye also even so unto them." Designers of the bill should think of its repressive provisions working against them. How would they like to be deprived of the privilege of visiting friends and relatives, of comforting the ill,

of paying final offices of respect to the dead? The proposed exclusion act failed to pass the state legislature. Quaker periodicals continued to denounce exclusion laws and to call upon Christians to assist in removing the stigma of inferiority from black men, to strive to secure for them equality of rights, and to help them gain an economic foothold as free men.²

An editorial in *The Friend*, Seventh Month 26, 1862, roundly flayed the operation of race prejudice as manifested in Congressional debate of general emancipation in the border states. It seemed to the Quaker editor that if the emancipation measures arose solely from political motives and the hope of injuring the rebels, while the hearts of the people were still filled with hate or ill will to the slave because of his dark skin and supposed inferiority, then perhaps "defeat and disaster" would attend efforts to suppress the rebellion. The lesson of the war was to teach the people that they were "no better in the Divine sight than those they have so unjustly despised and injured" and that Americans must become willing to recognize the Negroes' claims as fellow men by admitting them "to an equal share in the rights and privileges which the government confers."

Quakers had repudiated colonization schemes long before the war had forced attention to the Negro's future.³ In the war period they denounced colonization as impracticable and un-Christian. A year before the founding of the Friends Freedmen's Association, their stand on deportation was given by *The Friend*.⁴

²Articles appeared, for example, in the following: *The Friend*, Twelfth Month 13, 1862, Twelfth Month 26, 1863, Fourth Month 2, 1864; *The Friends' Review*, Fourth Month 5, 1862, Seventh Month 26, 1862; and *The Freedman's Friend*, Seventh Month, 1864, and Tenth Month, 1864.

³The Friends had condemned colonization as "the unrighteous work of expatriation" in the period of the greatest success of the American Colonization Society, the decade of the 1840's. Harlow Lindley, "The Anti-Slavery Separation in Indiana and the 'Henry Clay Incident,'" *BULLETIN OF FRIENDS HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION*, VI (1915), 34.

⁴*The Friend*, Twelfth Month 13, 1862. Earlier (Second Month 23, 1861), *The Friends' Review* had carried an editorial, "The New Home for the Negro," which observed that Great Britain was successfully experimenting with cotton growing on the West Coast of Africa. It called attention to a new English organization, the African Aid Society headed

Politicians, legislators, and private citizens, wrote the editor, thought it good policy to prevent Negroes from spreading throughout the country and that it was wise to induce or force them to expatriate themselves from the land where they had lived for two centuries and in one portion of which they composed nearly the whole of the laboring, producing class. Athletic and enduring laborers were needed to develop the land, and to propose to drive out of a country "notoriously addicted to the acquirement and love of wealth" a laboring force of four million, or to refuse to allow them to work anywhere in the country was contrary to what history taught to be wise and profitable. Thus its advocacy could be accounted for only on the ground of "inveterate, unreasoning" prejudice against the race. The editor hoped that before colonization schemes could overcome their handicaps those held as slaves would have become established on the soil they tilled as free laborers, and that enlightened self-interest would have broken down barriers erected by states to keep out a class whose help was becoming acutely necessary for the development of the national wealth.

The editor of *The Friends' Review*, Fourth Month 5, 1862, had bluntly dismissed expatriation schemes in these words: "That the coloured population have an equal right with the white race to 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,' *in this country* [editor's italics] is a proposition which cannot be controverted on any principle of reason, humanity, or religion."

Besides condemning anti-Negro legislation and deportation schemes, Friends attacked race prejudice and its resultant concept of the black man as an inferior being by proposing rational analysis of the slave mentality. For example, *The Friend*, Twelfth

by Lord Alfred Churchill, with the avowed aim "to enable the colored people in every part of the world, *and more especially those in the United States of America and Canada* [editor's italics], to reach, when they desired it, the western coast of Africa, and there to live in security and equality, carrying back with them to their fatherland all the habits of civilized life which they have picked up elsewhere." While "intestinal dissensions" were tearing the United States to pieces, England was preparing for the "colonization and cottonization" of Africa on a grand scale. The editor stated emphatically that the Negro American had a right to a home in the land of his birth.

Month 13, 1862, decided "to glance at the causes which had brought about the present degraded condition, intellectually, of our coloured population, giving rise to the false and vicious notion of their being an inferior race." The editor found in the necessities of slavery the reasons for the apparent inferiority. To become a good slave a man had to be placed in circumstances in which he must not comprehend his rights as a man and successfully struggle to obtain them. To become a good slave it was an absolute necessity that a man be kept as a mere working machine dispossessed of every right but such as he obtained in common with the ox or the horse he worked with, that his mind should be called into action as little as possible, no more than was necessary to enable him to perform his daily task; that every ray of light which might stimulate and strengthen his intellectual faculties should be carefully excluded from him; that his "mental emotions and his natural affections" should be constantly disregarded or crushed out; and that he should be invariably taught to believe he was of a race so inferior to his master that to administer to that master's wants it was right and proper that he should labor unceasingly, aspiring to little if any higher position than that of the beast. To render this policy supremely effectual in attaining the end desired, the system clothed the master with absolute and irresponsible power over the slave's time, pleasures, labors, and family ties. The minds of slaves had been kept continuously in darkness and gross ignorance; "the bodies connected with those minds . . . consigned by those who claimed to own them, to exhausting toil and suffering, while their food and raiment, their domestic and social relations, their barbarous punishments and helpless abasement all combined to render many of the finer feelings of their nature undeveloped or obtuse, to stunt their intellect and to shut out all ambition if not all hope to rise above the wretched lot in which they found themselves placed." Since every person of average intelligence knows the effect of external repression upon his own mental processes and capabilities, could he reasonably dismiss the effects of slavery, the supreme repression, upon a man by calling them evidences of inferiority? "Is it not rather surprising that under the circumstances so many among this crushed and downtrodden people have shown so much mental vigor and manly development as have been displayed by them?"

Rationalization of the slave mentality suggested that Quakers thought of the men emerging from bondage as victims of a prolonged traumatic neurosis which would begin to heal when they were placed under favorable conditions.

As they observed Negroes emerging from bondage, Friends noted desirable traits of character in them, hoping that other white persons would also see that of God and abandon their hostility to the emancipated. Negroes loved liberty, said Quaker observers, even as other men. Marmaduke C. Cope, a founder of the Friends Freedmen's Association, wrote from a refugee camp in Virginia:

In an old building near Norfolk, without any floor, and with no fire except what could be made without any chimney, we found four aged men, probably from 60 to 80 years of age; they had nothing to lie on but a *plank* apiece, and no covering but some old rags . . . worn out by unpaid toil, crippled with rheumatism, and lying in an old dilapidated building It made our hearts ache, and yet they thanked the Lord that they should die free, having lived slaves.⁵

A reporter for *The Friend*, Fourth Month 2, 1864, was impressed by the many examples he had seen of devoted slave parents trying to bring their children into Union lines. A poignant story lingered in his memory of a father who toiled through a hundred and fifty miles of rebel-infested territory only to be told by Union army officers that he could not leave his children, that he must surrender his horse and wagon, and that he could not return for his wife. The saddened man gathered his children together and walked back into slavery to rejoin his wife rather than separate his family.

Not only did the Negro love freedom as did other men; he could be taught to appreciate its privileges and responsibilities, being as educable as other men.⁶ As early as Eighth Month 25,

⁵Marmaduke C. Cope, Report to the Friends Freedmen's Association (1863).

⁶The Southern fiction that the Negro was uneducable was countered neatly in an anecdote by a Northern teacher among the freedmen. A white Southern woman told her that she was wasting her time, as she "might as well try to teach . . . [a] horse or a mule to read, as to teach those n[egroes]. They *can't* learn." "Then why," asked the teacher, "did you make stringent laws against what could not be done?" Eilzabeth Hyde Botume, *First Days among the Contrabands* (Boston, 1893), p. 4.

1862, a year before he went South to see for himself, Marmaduke C. Cope wrote to John Joseph Pease, an English Friend who had sat in the Parliament which abolished slavery, that encouraging reports of the Negroes' aptness for learning, their industry and sobriety, were coming to the Women's Aid Society.⁷ Later, when he did visit camps of Negro refugees, he went into a schoolroom near Yorktown, Virginia, where "the clear and animated responses of the children to the general exercises could scarcely be excelled in any of our Northern cities."⁸ On the front seat he noted three exceptions, the reason for their dullness being that they had just arrived from slavery the preceding day. "Soon, however," he wrote, "the privileges of freedom will raise their dormant faculties."

So far as his observations went, wrote Samuel R. Shipley of the Executive Committee of the Friends Freedmen's Association to *The Friend*, Eleventh Month 28, 1863, "the . . . [freedmen] are remarkably free from the prevailing vices of the North — intemperance and profanity." In the period that he was visiting refugee camps on the Mississippi River, he never heard an oath or any improper language or witnessed any rude or quarrelsome behavior. In their tractability and willingness to submit to the teaching of those concerned about their welfare and improvement he found encouragement and inspiration.

There was perhaps an excess of optimism in the comments of observers who noted the facility with which eager children and some adults acquired book-learning, who admired the heroic sufferings that fleeing slaves endured to reach freedom. That there were many exceptions to the bright scholars, brave family men, and industrious government laborers and soldiers was amply attested and readily believed by pro-slavery onlookers who sneered at the idea of transforming ex-slaves into independent, literate citizens. However, it seemed to Marmaduke C. Cope that "truth was being left free to combat error and many changes were going on in the public mind."⁹ Such eminent men as Phillips Brooks

⁷Cope Papers, Quaker Collection, Haverford College Library.

⁸Marmaduke C. Cope, Report.

⁹Marmaduke C. Cope to John Pease, Eighth Month 25, 1862, Cope Papers.

and David Livingston spoke publicly of their belief that the American freedmen could be lifted out of degradation. Brooks said that the experiment of sending teachers to Port Royal, South Carolina, had proved that the freed black man was capable of a will to work, a desire to learn, an appreciation of liberty, a healthy social ambition, and a practical and effective religion. Moreover, it had proved that the Negro was capable of manifesting those qualities in a very large degree, that when the disadvantages under which he had labored were removed, his progress was remarkable indeed.¹⁰ Dr. Fred Tomkins, Secretary of the British Freedmen's Aid Society, read to a meeting of that Society a letter from David Livingston dated May 16, 1865, in which Livingston expressed sympathy for "our kinsmen across the ocean" and congratulated them upon the abolition of slavery and their efforts to elevate the freedmen: "I have no fears as to the mental and moral capacity of the Africans for civilization and upward progress," he wrote.¹¹ He believed them "capable of holding an honourable rank in the family of mankind."

The first report of the Executive Committee of the Friends Freedmen's Association of Philadelphia stated certain conclusions growing out of the Quakers' consideration of the status of the black man in the Civil War period. First, the Friends concluded that ex-slaves, however passively they might have seemed to acquiesce in their servile conditions while subject to the power of masters, had always cherished the hope and expectation of a coming day of release, and when its advent was realized, they were eager to embrace it.¹² Chronic bondage had not utterly debased them below any appreciation of a higher condition of life, as had been popularly believed. Secondly, the Quakers concluded, the ex-slaves' thirst for knowledge was beyond all expecta-

¹⁰*Report of the Proceedings of a Meeting Held at Concert Hall, Philadelphia on Tuesday Evening, November 3, 1863, to Take into Consideration the Condition of the Freed People of the South* (Philadelphia, 1863), pp. 14-15.

¹¹National Committee of British Freedmen's Aid Societies, *Report of the Proceedings at Meetings Held at the Westminster Palace Hotel, May 17, 1865* (London, 1865), p. 45.

¹²Friends Freedmen's Association, *Report of First Six Months Work, Fourth Month 16, 1864*.

tion, and their general capacity for acquiring the rudiments of education fully equal to that of the Anglo-Saxon race. Third, a majority of them evinced energy and thrift in the pursuit of labor for their own support, when a fair opportunity and the stimulus of adequate compensation were afforded, while some showed mental qualifications for positions of trust and management. Finally, the Committee concluded, there existed among the ex-bondmen as a class an impressibility of heart on religious subjects which rendered them eminently susceptible to spiritual improvement.

In the year of these conclusions, darkness and obscurity enshrouded the future of the colored Americans, but the upheaval and disintegration of states and communities by war, which had freed so many, were augmenting the tide of fugitives to be succored. The work had just begun. Could Friends falter on the threshold? Had they not been the special champions of the Negro in bondage? Should his emerging freedom cause them to withdraw their sympathy and aid at a period when he sorely needed them? The history of the first two years of civil war had opened an inspiring view of labors and sacrifices for the successors of Woolman and Benezet, to close only when human rights should no longer be gauged by the color of the skin nor "the possession of African blood be deemed a forfeiture of the dearest privileges appertaining to civilization and Christianity."¹³

II

Who, then, were the men whose voices were lifted in defense of the outcasts, who labored and sacrificed for them? Although the Friends Freedmen's Association was not organized until Eleventh Month, 1863, this did not mean that Quakers had not been active in the freedmen's aid movement. On the contrary, Philadelphia Friends had taken part in organizing the Port Royal Relief Committee which had expanded into the Pennsylvania Freedmen's Relief Association in July, 1862. Moreover, there existed within Philadelphia Yearly Meeting as early as Third Month, 1862, an organization known as the Gentlemen's

¹³Friends Freedmen's Association, *Ninth Annual Report* (Philadelphia, Fourth Month 11, 1871).

Aid Society, mention being made of it in the manuscript records of the Women's Aid Society: "A committee composed of Sarah W. Cope and Hannah Beasley was appointed 'to call upon the Gentlemen's Aid Committee to ask for a portion of the funds collected by them . . . [for relief of Negro refugees in the South]'.¹⁴ The Women's Aid Society must have been founded at a meeting on Third Month 12, 1862, for the first minute speaks of a gathering on that date of women concerned about conditions among the "contrabands."¹⁵ On Third Month 26, 1862, the Gentlemen's Aid Society is mentioned again by the Secretary of the Women's Aid Society; she records that the men had given them two hundred dollars and the promise of more. On Fourth Month 9, 1862, she wrote of "our efficient helper M. C. Cope [the husband of Sarah]," who had got ready four boxes of relief supplies. Finally, on Eleventh Month 14, 1862, she recorded that the care of passing boxes and barrels through the custom-house and attending to their transportation—a task that had hitherto devolved chiefly upon Marmaduke C. Cope—had led Mr. Cope to consider asking some of the young men Friends interested in the cause to organize themselves into a committee. It was particularly desirable that such a group contain men accustomed to business transactions. The names of J. Wistar Evans, James Whitall, George Scattergood, and Bartholomew Beasley were proposed as suitable, and the subject was left to be mentioned to them with the suggestion that they "consider the propriety of such an organization." The Women's Aid Society carried on freedmen's relief with the help of the Gentlemen's Aid Committee, probably headed by Marmaduke C. Cope, until the young men Friends organized the Association of Friends of Philadelphia and

¹⁴Manuscript Minutes, Women's Aid Society, Archives, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, Third Month 12, 1862, filed with records of the Friends Freedmen's Association. The two organizations merged informally in 1865.

¹⁵*The Friend*, Tenth Month 4, 1862, noted that the Women's Aid Society had been "instituted within the last six months for the purpose of co-operating with an association of similar character called 'The National Freedman's Relief Society,' in providing clothing and other necessities, for the destitute coloured people, lately slaves, who are now under the protection of the United States Government."

its Vicinity for the Relief of Colored Freedmen, Eleventh Month 5, 1863, at 304 Arch Street, Philadelphia.¹⁶ Twenty-six men met "to consider the subject of the freedmen in the Southern states and to take measures for their relief if way should open."¹⁷

Graduates of Haverford College, rising young industrialists, scientists, members of the professions, and "gentlemen" were among the founders, all bearing names which had been and would be associated with every humanitarian movement in Quaker life. Only a Benezet is missing from the list: Marmaduke C. Cope, Richard Cadbury, Samuel R. Shipley, George Scattergood, William Evans, Jr., Benjamin Coates, Isaac Morgan, Jr., John S. Hilles, James Whitall, George Vaux, John C. Allen, John W. Cadbury, Joel Cadbury, Jr., Thomas Scattergood, Henry Haines, Earl Shinn, Jr., Jacob Smedley, Jr., Anthony M. Kimber, Thomas Elkinton, John B. Garrett, George Rhoads, Philip C. Garrett, James T. Shinn, George L. Garrett, John E. Carter, and Samuel Woolman. The first Executive Committee consisted of Samuel R. Shipley, President; John B. Garrett, Secretary; Richard Cadbury, Treasurer; and these members: Marmaduke C. Cope, Anthony M. Kimber, Philip C. Garrett, Thomas Scattergood, Benjamin Coates, William Evans, Jr., James Whitall, John S. Hilles, Elliston P. Morris, J. Wistar Evans, Joel Cadbury, Jr., George Vaux, Henry Haines, Dr. Charles and Dr. James Rhoads, Edward Bettie, George L. Garrett, Ashton Richardson, Richard Mott, William M. Canby, Nathan Hilles, Israel H. Johnson, John W. Cadbury, and Francis Stokes.

Quaker relief for freedmen as it began in Philadelphia was a young Friends' movement, as the American Friends Service Committee was to be at its inception half a century later. The average

¹⁶In the ninety-three years since its founding the Friends Freedmen's Association has had several informal and unofficial variations of its original name, such as Friends' Association of Philadelphia and its Vicinity for the Relief and Education of Colored Freedmen, Association of Friends of Philadelphia and Its Vicinity for the Relief and Education of Freedmen, Friends Association of Philadelphia for the Relief of Freedmen. It was incorporated in March, 1903, as the Friends Freedmen's Association.

¹⁷MS Minutes, Executive Committee, Friends Freedmen's Association, Eleventh Month 5, 1863.

age of the twenty-six founders was 31.8; the youngest members were Thomas Scattergood and Edward Bettle, just twenty, and the oldest was Marmaduke C. Cope, fifty-seven. Fifteen of the founders were under thirty years of age; twenty members of the Association and the first Executive Committee were in their twenties or thirties. The Association could have been termed a club of merchant-manufacturers. Of the thirty-five comprising the original Association and the first Executive Committee, nine were merchants and eight were manufacturers. Three were without occupation. Two were "gentlemen." There were two each of the following occupations: teaching, pharmacy, and medicine. One writer, one farmer, one surveyor, one druggist, and one bookstore manager became members. Throughout their lives nearly all the founders contributed time, funds, and leadership to education and humanitarian causes to such a consistent degree that their descendants truly walk in a tradition.

Edward Bettle, one of the twenty-year-oldsters, became a manager of the Pennsylvania Institute for the Deaf and Dumb, a member of the Board of Friends Asylum for the Insane, and a member of the Provident Society for Employing the Poor.¹⁸ Benjamin Coates brought to the Association a wealth of experience in antislavery causes. In the year of the Great Compromise, he had corresponded with the statesman Henry Clay about a scheme for gradual emancipation in the South which he hoped Clay would present to the states.¹⁹ He had also labored for diplomatic recognition of the Republic of Liberia, asking Clay to support this project also. "The elevation of the masses, and the christianizing of the African and Indian . . . [were] especially near his heart."²⁰ From his interest in Liberia he produced a small book,

¹⁸Ten of the founders of the Friends Freedmen's Association also served as managers of the Friends Asylum for the Insane, which had been founded in 1813: John C. Allen (who served from 1845 to 1895), Elliston P. Morris (1858), John E. Carter (1867-1890), James Whitall (1867-1891), Henry Haines (1867-1895), J. Wistar Evans (1874-1893), Thomas Scattergood (1877-1907), Joel Cadbury (1891). Later members who served on the Board of the Asylum were David Scull and Francis R. Cope.

¹⁹Mary Coates, *Family Memorials and Recollections; or Aunt Mary's Patchwork* (Philadelphia, 1885), Appendix, 143-46.

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 69.

Cotton Cultivation in Africa: Suggestions on the Importance of the Cultivation of Cotton in Reference to the Abolition of Slavery (1850). Thomas S. Elkinton belonged to a family active in benevolences for American Indians and the Russian Doukhobors.²¹ The concern for the Russian peasants was to occupy the Elkinton family for successive generations. J. Wistar Evans, whose brief life ended at thirty-seven, also left to his descendants a heritage of humanitarian interests. The Evans family of the twentieth century were among the first members of the American Friends Service Committee, and among his descendants are two generations of active workers in both the Service Committee and the peace movement. As one of the founders of the Friends Freedmen's Association, Evans went to visit camps of refugees in Virginia and the District of Columbia in 1863, making a report of his observations upon his return. He was accompanied by William Evans, Jr., Philadelphia druggist with a deep interest in astronomy (atop his house was a four and one-half inch telescope). William Evans was an active member of the Association for over a decade. He was also treasurer of the Doukhobor Committee of Philadelphia and journeyed with Joseph Elkinton to their settlement in Canada in 1899.

Samuel Hilles, first president of the Friends Freedmen's Association, had been superintendent of Haverford College in 1833-34. Throughout a long life—he died at eighty-five—he was associated with the development of Haverford College and Westtown School. The twin brothers, Dr. James and Dr. Charles Rhoads, were both founders of the Association. Dr. James labored among the freedmen in Virginia as physician and superintendent; in 1871 he became president of the Association. Later, Bryn Mawr chose him as her first president. Thomas Scattergood, youngest member of the first Executive Committee, served as its treasurer several years and was an active member of the Instruction Committee. He was the father of the twentieth-century businessmen

²¹Joseph Elkinton (1859-1923), brother of Thomas S. Elkinton, wrote *The Doukhobors; their History in Russia, their Migration to Canada* (Philadelphia, 1903). He visited the Canadian settlements of Doukhobors in 1899, having met the first shipload of 2,000 when they arrived.

and humanitarians, J. Henry and Alfred C. Scattergood.²² The two Shinn brothers, Earl and James, were respectively a professional writer and a pharmacist. Earl retired from public view behind the pen name of "Edward Strahan."²³ James became a manager of the Working Home for Blind Men and the Catherine Street House for Industry. He held membership in the Philadelphia Fuel Savings Society and the Indian Rights Association. In 1880-82 he was president of the American Pharmaceutical Association. A sister of the Shinn married Samuel R. Shipley, president of the first Executive Committee of the Association. Elliston P. Morris, philanthropist, became a member of the Board of Friends Asylum for the Insane, a manager of the Penn Charter School, and Secretary of the Corporation of Haverford College.

The pre-war Underground Railroad activities of the Garrett family of Delaware had been costly. Thomas Garrett of Wilmington was tried before Chief Justice Taney in New Castle, Delaware, in May, 1849, for violating the property rights of a planter whose slaves Garrett had helped to freedom. Damages due took all his property. When sentence had been pronounced, the sixty-year-old Garrett said: "Judge, thou hast not left me a dollar, but I wish to say to thee, and to all in this courtroom, that if any one knows of a fugitive who wants a shelter and a friend, send him to Thomas Garrett and he will befriend him."²⁴ His plunge into bankruptcy failed to halt the family's interest in the slaves. Allied by marriage to the Scattergood family, Garretts appeared among the founders of the Friends Freedmen's Association, serving as chairmen of

²²In 1929 President Herbert Hoover appointed Charles J. Rhoads and J. Henry Scattergood Commissioners of Indian Affairs. At the time of his death in 1953, J. Henry Scattergood had been for fifty years the treasurer of the Friends Freedmen's Association.

²³Earl Shinn's reasons for writing under a nom de plume were "as plenty as blackberries," he wrote, but the important one was "the restricted but distinct respect my father acquired for his own name in a field altogether religious and as different from belles lettres as light from darkness. My Christian name happens to be the same as his and any publicity attached to it in literature would seem the most farcical of incongruities, both to many excellent people and myself." "Edward Strahan" to R. Sheldon, n. d., Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

²⁴Rufus M. Jones, *Later Periods of Quakerism* (London, 1921), II, 576.

committees and officers. George S. Garrett was father of Sarah, who married Thomas Scattergood. John B. Garrett, Phi Beta Kappa, graduate of Haverford College, manufacturer, merchant, President of the Girard Trust Company of Philadelphia, Vice President of the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, was one of the commissioners appointed by President U. S. Grant to locate the Osage Indians. His scholarly interests led him into the American Academy of Political Science; in 1890-91 he served as Acting President of Haverford College. He wrote essays on peace, capital punishment, self-defense, oaths, and marriage and divorce under the title, *Four Lectures on Some of the Distinguishing Views of Friends* (Philadelphia, 1890). Philip C. Garrett became active in many charitable enterprises and welfare organizations. He was chairman of the Pennsylvania State Lunacy Committee, President of the Indian Rights Association, and a member of the "Committee of 70," a group of civic-minded persons of Philadelphia who study political situations with a view to recommending constructive changes. He had a deep interest in learning, attested by membership in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the American Philosophical Society, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. At one time he was President of the Board of Trustees of Bryn Mawr College.

Three brothers took part in the founding of the Friends Freedmen's Association: Richard Cadbury, its first treasurer, John W. Cadbury, member of the first Executive Committee, and Joel Cadbury, Jr., also a member of the first Executive Committee and in 1868-70 Secretary of the Executive Committee. Their sister, Sarah Cadbury, taught at the freedmen's school in Yorktown, Virginia, in 1866.²⁵ The brothers were active in educational causes, Joel being a manager of Haverford College and a member of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences. He was also a manager of the Friends Asylum for the Insane. Richard Cadbury was a steward of the Pennsylvania Hospital and a manager of Haverford College from 1865 until his death in 1897. As the first chairman of the important Committee on the Pur-

²⁵Sarah Cadbury's manuscript diary of her stay in Virginia is in the library of her great-niece, Mary Hoxie Jones. The diary contains a drawing of the Slabtown community where she taught.

chasing and Forwarding of Goods for the Association, Joel Cadbury, Jr. busied himself gathering, baling, and shipping both new and used garments for the refugees. In the present century descendants of the Cadbury brothers have been active in the organization of the American Friends Service Committee, the peace movement, education, and race relations.

III

Entering into an expanded phase of the ancient testimony against slavery required a formal organization. The Society of Friends has been one of the most decentralized of all churches since the time of George Fox. So "when the Society feels it right to tackle some emergency job," writes Roger C. Wilson, "it has to do so by means of a specially constituted organization or sub-organization, and the sense of purpose has to be strong before this is done."²⁶ The sense of purpose felt by the successors of Woolman and Benezet led them to constitute the Friends Association of Philadelphia and Its Vicinity for the Relief of Colored Freedmen on the Fifth of Eleventh Month, 1863. A Committee drew up at its meeting of Eleventh Month 12, 1863, a draft of a constitution to be presented to the formal association. The first article read:

In order to relieve the wants, to provide for the instruction, and to protect the rights of the freedmen of the South, as far as the means contributed will allow, the contributors for this object hereby resolve themselves into an Association to be called "The Friends' Association of Philadelphia and Its Vicinity for the Relief of Colored Freedmen." Its purpose shall be to use every means in its power to further the object indicated in the title. . . .

Originally the Constitution said that any person making contribution or donation would be deemed a member, but an amendment restricted membership to Friends. Committees appointed to administer the work were: Finance, Publication, Purchasing and Forwarding, Instruction, Protection of Rights, Conference, and Nomination of New Members.

²⁶*Quaker Relief: An Account of the Relief Work of the Society of Friends, 1940-1948* (London, 1952), p. 1.

The first official act of the new organization was to request Marmaduke C. Cope to examine the conditions and wants of the freedmen on the Virginia Peninsula as he made a tour of camps. It authorized him to draw on the treasurer, Richard Cadbury, for funds to relieve distress as he saw need. Accompanied by Sarah W. Cope, he went to Virginia late in November, 1863, where he was to explore the field of labor and to choose one section as a permanent field of operations. To assist him in making choice of a "pilot project" were Benjamin Coates, Dr. Charles Rhoads, Richard Cadbury, William Evans, Jr., and Philip C. Garrett. Considerable interest attached to their choice of Slabtown-Acreville, a community in Yorktown, Virginia, for it was the first home for refugees from slavery, having been built in 1862 by the ex-Quaker, General Isaac Jones Wistar, who had been disowned by Arch Street Meeting for joining the Union Army. Friends initiated their pioneer experiment in community improvement on this site, and Slabtown-Acreville became a model for future projects.

In reviewing the work of the Association during its first six months, from Eleventh Month, 1863, to Fourth Month, 1864, one must inquire how it was financed, what it accomplished, and what conclusions may be drawn therefrom. Individual contributions during the first month ranged from one dollar to a thousand.²⁷ Among the first contributors was Eliza Gurney, the Friend to whom Abraham Lincoln had written that the Civil War had plunged the antiwar, antislavery Quakers into a painful dilemma. Mrs. Gurney's contributions for the next six years were liberal; she eventually assumed full responsibility for the upkeep of an orphanage for freedmen's children at Salem, New Jersey. Total individual contributions in the first six months were \$9,165.05. In addition monthly meetings in Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey made contributions of \$3,779.61 between Twelfth Month 2, 1863, and Third Month 7, 1864. Included was £220.18 from London Meeting for Sufferings and Holm Monthly Meeting of Cumberland, England.²⁸ By Twelfth Month 8, 1863,

²⁷Minute Book, Record of Contributions, 1863-1864.

²⁸Idem. After 1864 the Association arranged with the Provident Society, a Philadelphia banking concern, to handle its financial records; information about financing the organization appears subsequently only

contributors had paid into the treasury over \$15,000 or about five hundred dollars a day. Two weeks later, this sum had reached \$19,323.53, with only about seven hundred dollars in unpaid subscriptions outstanding. On the sixteenth of Fourth Month, 1864, Richard Cadbury reported that in the first six months of its existence the Friends Freedmen's Association had received \$57,256.47 from American, English, and Irish Quakers, as well as some non-Quakers.²⁹

In the same period the Association spent \$42,764.42 for goods and services to freedmen. This meant that an income of nearly ten thousand dollars a month was spent at the rate of eight thousand dollars monthly for refugees who numbered, it was estimated, 180,269; with 79,000 of them virtually on the doorsteps of Philadelphia Quakers—in Eastern North Carolina, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. The work divided into two parts, the first concerning the physical, the second the "higher wants" of the freedmen. Thus from the outset the two most active committees were Instruction and Purchasing-and-Forwarding. The latter reported that in the first six weeks of operation they had cut 11,844 garments and distributed 10,879 to sewing societies and the House of Industry for completion. Thirty-four cases and bales had been forwarded to the Mississippi Valley, Newbern, North Carolina, and Fortress Monroe, Virginia. They had bought four cases of woolen shirts in Cincinnati and forwarded them to Vicksburg, Mississippi, where Elkanah Beard, freedmen's relief agent for Western Friends, and Levi Coffin, agent for Indiana Yearly Meeting, had undertaken distribution for the Philadelphians. Joel Cadbury's hard-working Committee

in the treasurer's reports and minutes of the Executive Committee. Extracts from a report of a Quaker society stated that English and Irish contributions in 1863 amounted to three thousand pounds (and the exchange rate noted in the report made the sum equivalent to the somewhat astonishing amount of nearly \$30,000), sent directly to the Friends Freedmen's Association. "Address of the Central Committee of the Society of Friends of Great Britain and Ireland for the Relief of the Emancipated Slaves," *The Freedman's Friend*, Third Month, 1864. The first published report of the Association stated that English and Irish contributions for the first six months were \$5,521.14.

²⁹Report, Friends Freedmen's Association, Fourth Month 16, 1864.

had sent a total of 31,875 garments South in the six months, three hundred blankets to North Carolina, twelve complete sets of shoemakers' tools to Helena, Arkansas, and four gross of knitting needles and forty pounds of knitting yarn to Vicksburg.

"Moral and intellectual improvement" of freedmen claimed the attention of the Committee on Instruction. The great task, wrote Marmaduke C. Cope to John Joseph Pease, Fourth Month 30, 1864, was "to supply the mental wants of our long oppressed sable brethren and sisters." He did not know the exact number, but he thought that since the inauguration of the Port Royal Experiment for relief and education in South Carolina, about four hundred teachers had taken the field: "The van of that peaceful army that we trust will diffuse the blessings of freedom where so long the curse of slavery has darkened the land."

The darkened portion of the land into which his organization hoped to throw a beam of light was the settlement on the Virginia peninsula, embracing the old, infirm, sick, and penniless men, women, and children left at Craney Island by General George McClellan when he retreated from Harrison's Landing. Daily their numbers were swelled by the arrival of destitute wanderers from Norfolk, Portsmouth, and many other parts of Virginia. The government had given them rations, and they had shelter of a sort, but since they were not permitted to leave the Island to seek work, they were completely destitute. So large had the numbers become that this community now merged into Slabtown and Acreville. The destitution could be imagined from a statement of Captain Charles Wilder, Army Superintendent for Freedmen in Yorktown, that he had seen sixty men with no more covering than a single shirt. Friends had seen women with no other attire than a ragged piece of carpet or sail cloth, begging for clothing for their children against the coming of winter. Not only was their physical suffering great, a matter immediately brought to the attention of the Purchasing and Forwarding Committee, but their educational needs were acute. Hope for relief lay in the government's plan to place some of them on abandoned plantations; meantime, they crowded into General Wistar's villages, forming an ignorant, depressed, poverty-stricken group, living in filthy, cold, and bare cabins. Thus, besides need for physical support,

clothing, and school instruction, there were matters in housekeeping and cultivation of the soil wherein the refugees stood in need of advice and guidance before the community could stand as a pilot light to others.

John C. Tatum of the Friends Freedmen's Association journeyed to Yorktown, Twelfth Month 10, 1863, to superintend and hasten the erection of a school building and a home for its superintendent in the Acreville-Slabtown community. On the twenty-third of Eleventh Month, 1863, Rachel Dennis of New Jersey went there as teacher at a salary of ten dollars a month. She began her work on the twenty-third of First Month, 1864, holding classes in the deserted master's mansion at the Darlington Plantation, teaching a morning session of about eighty children and an afternoon session of older pupils. William H. Burgess, a Friend from New York, used the same room for an evening school for adults.³⁰ Both teachers were awaiting the completion of a schoolhouse on the plantation, to be built by freedmen who had donated their services. Alfred and Henry Cope, Philadelphia Quakers, had given five hundred dollars for the purchase of lumber and other materials. Shortly after Rachel Dennis arrived in Virginia, the Committee on Instruction employed Edward W. Holway to superintend relief and education there, succeeding John C. Tatum. Holway, a young Friend from New York, had been drafted and released by the Secretary of War.³¹ For two years he and his wife Elizabeth lived in the Slabtown-Acreville community, dispensing clothing and medicines and teaching residents good citizenship by precept and example. On First Month 14, 1864, the Committee on Instruction reported that 3,737 students had been enrolled in the day and night schools in Virginia, with an

³⁰William H. Burgess had been drafted in 1863. Released by the Secretary of War, he went to Yorktown to work among freedmen, remaining there about a year. *Report, Committee of the Representatives of New York Meeting of Friends upon the Conditions and Wants of the Colored Refugees* (New York, 1864), p. 10.

³¹"Edward H[olway] gave us a thrilling account of his experience when he was drafted, would not serve, and was taken to the front and was kept in suspension for five weeks, expecting to be tortured and shot, a fearful time for him . . ." wrote Sarah Cadbury in her diary, Third Month 23, 1866, at Yorktown, where she had gone to teach.

average daily attendance of 1,319. The First Day Schools had an enrollment of 21,185. A second teacher, Rhoda W. Smith, was appointed to the area in Eleventh Month, 1863. Besides hiring teachers for the schools built by the Association at its pilot project, the Committee on Instruction helped to pay salaries of teachers of other associations in Tennessee, Arkansas, and North Carolina, and sent books, slates, pencils, and other supplies to numbers of schools.

Hope was expressed in the first year that the Friends Freedmen's Association could help solve the problem of self-support at the pilot project. Tentative approaches were made, such as supplying farmers and gardeners with seeds, farm animals, and implements. Two Friends from Ohio, Lemuel Hole and his son, leased a farm in the area and proceeded to teach freedmen how to farm by making their land a model. The Farming Committee sent the Holes a quantity of tools, goods, and animals for distribution. Another project growing out of concern that freedmen become self-supporting was the freedmen's stores. The army forbade free trade within military lines; licenses to sell goods were furnished a limited number of sutlers, whose business was consequently large and without adequate restriction against exorbitant prices. To relieve Negroes from the burden of trying to purchase necessities under such conditions, the government invited the Friends Freedmen's Association to open stores at points within the military departments of Virginia and North Carolina, with the strict rule that stores were to be for freedmen only. Hampton, Virginia, about two miles from Fortress Monroe, was the site of the first store. Enoch Harlan of Coatesville, Pennsylvania, took charge of the store as well as general oversight of other stores to be established in Southeastern Virginia, with Ira J. Parker of Muncy, Pennsylvania, as his assistant. To finance the stores the Association borrowed \$5,500 from Philadelphia Friends, interest-free, returnable within a year. The project had just got under way at the expiration of the first half year.

IV

Certain conclusions arise from an examination of the opening phases of freedmen's aid undertaken by the Friends Freedmen's Association. During the first six months, the Quakers reached

two decisions; namely, to concentrate their efforts for the time being on the area around Yorktown, Virginia, where about three thousand Negroes were living in settlements built by the ex-Quaker, General Isaac Jones Wistar; and second, to engage in three types of work—relief of physical suffering, economic aid to make freedmen self-sufficient, and provision of schools and teachers. Progress was made in relief and education, but attempts to help refugees become independent were tentative and fragmentary, consisting mainly of supplying them with garden seeds, agricultural implements, and some of the tools of skilled workmen. The Association spent a large budget generously for its own activities and to help other organizations in Virginia, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and North Carolina.

It was obvious from the beginning that the task of freedmen's aid would burst the bonds of providing clothing and shelter for a few hundred thousand refugees; it was obvious that the task was the "elevation" of the four million ex-slaves from the depths of ignorance and poverty—as noted by the Quaker organization in its first annual report. Tentative economic projects could only emphasize the extreme poverty of the Negro and the absence of any plan by government, charity, or Negro for ameliorating that poverty. Union army victories were increasing the numbers to be aided and intensifying every problem in emancipation, thus far merely adumbrated by the appearance of the first two hundred thousand knocking at Northern gates. It was fortunate, therefore, in view of the enormity of the future task, that freedmen's aid was a charity that attracted a group of able men, foremost in the civic and economic life of Philadelphia and its vicinity, experienced leaders in humanitarian endeavors, inheritors of a tradition of benevolence toward the Negro, and thus the right men to continue the work of Woolman and Benezet.

BERNARD SHAW AND THE QUAKERS

By WARREN S. SMITH*

I . . . being often challenged to denominate myself . . . have ceased to reply that my nearest to an established religion is the Society of Friends, and while calling myself a Creative Evolutionist, might also call myself a Jainist Tirthankara as of eight thousand years ago. . . .¹

In 1950, his ninety-fourth and last year of life, Bernard Shaw made the above statement as a sort of aside while he was commenting for the *Atlantic Monthly* on the recent publication of Dean Inge's *Diary of a Dean*. And two years before, in a preface for Richard Albert Wilson's *The Miraculous Birth of Language*, he had predicted that the next generation would not be so puzzled about his classification of himself as "a Quaker of sorts."²

Many persons today, including most Friends, *would* be puzzled by such a classification, even with the limiting phrase of *sorts* appended; but perhaps that is at least partially because it is so difficult to dismiss from our minds the image of wit, mountebank, and idol-smasher which he had so carefully created for us over so many years, and which tended (often to his own annoyance) to obscure the truly mystical side of his personality. But no earnest reader of his works or viewer of his plays could ever miss the clear voice of the prophet nor doubt that his latter-day affinity for the Society of Friends was anything but sincere.

Miss Blanche Patch, the secretary of his later years, recalls his reply when a member of the press inquired (facetiously, I'm sure) whether he had not turned Roman Catholic: "I am not a Roman Catholic. . . . If I had to be fitted into any religious denomination, the Society of Friends, who are at the opposite pole to the

* Associate Professor of Theatre Arts, The Pennsylvania State University. Warren Smith has discussed Shaw's attitude towards Christianity generally in *The Nation* for July 28, 1956.

¹ G. B. Shaw, "If I Were a Priest," *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 185, no. 5 (May 1950), p. 70.

² Shaw, Preface to *The Miraculous Birth of Language* by Richard Albert Wilson (New York: Philosophical Library, 1948), p. 19.

Roman Catholics, would have the best chance."³ But he goes on to say once more that in view of his very explicit writings on the subject there is no excuse for describing him as a member of any of the Churches.

S. J. Woolf reports also that Shaw claimed to have the same religion as that of Dean Inge. "We are both Quakers," he explained. "We don't believe in set prayers. When we want to talk with God, we use the same language that we ordinarily use, not prayers composed for us by other people, and we do not need a church to hold communion with him."⁴

A similar report is given by his Quaker neighbor at Ayot St. Lawrence:

One Sunday when I had just returned from a Friends Meeting, he and I talked about the Quaker faith. He said that he was a Quaker by temperament but not by faith. He could not define his faith and did not want to, but the accepted mythologies did not appeal to him. He said:

"What an amazing title for a religious organization: Friends! That in itself was a stroke of genius. I believe in the discipline of silence and could talk for hours about it. . . ."⁵

Then he told Stephen Winsten that he believed the "spontaneous" prayer of the Quakers involved long and arduous preparation just as his own "spontaneous" speeches always did; and he further chides Friends for denying the kind of religious healing that is to be found in art and music. In this he shows himself, as in nearly all his statements about Friends, to be more understanding of their historical positions than of their contemporary practices.

Back of these proclamations, all made in his old age, lie more than casual thoughts about Friends. The Quakers (and especially George Fox) had inhabited his mind and writings for years. From the very beginnings it was obvious enough that there was something akin to religious interest in his approach to the social and biological sciences; and in 1909 (when Shaw was a mere fifty-three) G. K. Chesterton observed: "Shaw has become

³ Blanche Patch, *Thirty Years With Bernard Shaw* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1951), p. 227.

⁴ S. J. Woolf, *Here Am I* (New York: Random House, 1941), p. 181.

⁵ Stephen Winsten, *Days with Bernard Shaw* (New York: Vanguard Press, 1949), p. 184.

a complete and colossal mystic. That mysticism does grow quite rationally out of his older arguments; but very few people ever troubled to trace the connection."⁶ Thereafter, Shaw became more and more outspoken about his preoccupation with religious thought until he saw fit, in 1932, to refer to himself as "a sort of unofficial Bishop of Everywhere."

But Friends as such do not seem to have been called into his special awareness until World War I when the plight of the conscientious objector (the "conshy," as he was then called) touched his humanitarianism. Shaw was never quite completely a pacifist, yet he had respect for many of the conshies and defended them in print—and, at least on one occasion, before a court-martial board. In his various wartime articles (which had large circulation and caused bitter controversy) he mentions Quakers often (usually as synonymous with *pacifists*)—sometimes to make a point, sometimes merely to spark his style. A few of these references, culled from his wartime writings between 1914 and 1920, serve to show the extent—and limits—of his conception of the Society as of that time:

The trouble with militarism, he is saying in 1914, is that it must keep feeding on more and more victories. Napoleon, for instance, conquered and conquered, yet had to go on fighting: "After exhausting the possible he had to attempt the impossible and go to Moscow. He failed: and from that moment he had better have been a Philadelphia Quaker than the victor of Marengo, Austerlitz, Jena, and Wagram."⁷ (Why a *Philadelphia* Quaker it is hard to say, unless he considers this a sort of superlative degree!)

The conscientious objector for whom he gave evidence at a court-martial was in reality a Freethinker, but realizing that a military court would not hold that a Freethinker had a conscience, he simply produced evidence that the man was a "fanatic" and

⁶ G. K. Chesterton, *George Bernard Shaw* (British Publishers Guild, 1949), p. 74.

⁷ *What I Really Wrote About The War* (New York: Brentano's 1931), p. 90.

left the court "to infer that a fanatic must be a hyperpious Quaker."⁸

In 1918 when the crumbling German government suddenly took the attitude that they had wanted nothing but peace all along, and made themselves to appear "in the attitude of grievously molested Quakers," British diplomats were so thrown off balance by this shift and their replies became so outrageous that Shaw advised the British command to "pray for a Government of Pacifists, of pro-Germans, of Quakers, even of certified lunatics as less dangerous than the uncertified ones."⁹

During the peace conference in 1919, United States Secretary of the Navy Daniels is forced to press for U. S. naval superiority, although he is "as little of a fire-eater as any Quaker."¹⁰ And when Admiral Lord Beatty, hero of Jutland, puts on the airs of peace he becomes "the amateur Quaker of the public dinner table."¹¹

Years later, in 1932, when Shaw was editing these articles for a volume, *What I Really Wrote About the War*, he appended the ironic note: "This utterance of mine had about as much effect on the proceedings at Versailles as the buzzing of a London fly has on the meditations of a whale in Baffin's Bay." He noted that the militarists had had it all their own way once more and had set off a rising state of tension and competitive armament "compared to which the *status quo ante bellum* was a Quaker's festival."¹²

Clearly he had begun to have Quakers on his mind, even though the references were sometimes merely facetious and sometimes even misleading. And from this period of the First World War until the end of his long life his works contain (1) a steady series of references to Friends and Friends' positions; (2) a growing interest in the life and teachings of George Fox; and (3) a surprising and heartening closeness to some—but notably not all—of Friends' basic beliefs and testimonies.

⁸ Ibid., p. 189.

⁹ Ibid., p. 245.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 298.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 328.

¹² Ibid., pp. 314-15.

1

It would not seem to be of much real value simply to catalog all of Shaw's references to Quakers, but a few selected references, arranged chronologically, even though they have no other coherence, may serve to show the pressures of Quaker influence on his own thinking. So far as I know, all significant references to Friends date from 1914 on, and most of them tend to stem from past history or contemporary social action. That is to say, they do not reveal that he ever worshiped with Friends or that he was deeply affected by writings, speeches, or conversations with Quakers of his own era.

In reviewing the various notions of Christianity in one of his most challenging pieces of prose, his Preface to *Androcles and the Lion* (which he separately titled "On the Prospects of Christianity," 1915) Shaw notes that "It is probable that Archbishop Laud and John Wesley died equally persuaded that he in whose name they had made themselves famous on earth would receive them in Heaven with open arms. George Fox, the Quaker, would have had ten times their chance; and yet Fox made rather a miserable business of life."¹³

In his preface to *St. Joan* (1924) he finds Friends a ready reference in discussing how much tolerance any society may have for the heretic: "The degree of tolerance attainable at any moment depends on the strain under which society is maintaining its cohesion. In war, for instance, we suppress the gospels and put Quakers in prison, muzzle the newspapers, and make it a serious offence to show a light at night."¹⁴

That he saw Joan of Arc as a kind of Quaker he reveals in the program note which he wrote for the first English production of the play (26 March 1924). The stated purpose of the note was to point out how much the play was actually historical, and he defends his view of Joan's judges as honorable and sincere men who did what they had to do: "She was burnt for heresy because she was guided by her inner light to the position taken two hundred years later by the Society of Friends, for which women

¹³ Preface, *Androcles and the Lion* in *Nine Plays* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1937), p. 914.

¹⁴ Preface, *St. Joan*, *Nine Plays*, p. 1021.

were judicially flogged mercilessly at the instance of the Church of England, and would have been burnt had they been Joan's contemporaries."¹⁵

Typical of Shaw's style is the wide sweeping statement which can gather Fox, Churchill, the Bolsheviks, and Dean Inge into a single reference! He happens to be discussing here the religious revolt of his friend, William Archer (1927): "The revolt against institutional religion which moved George Fox to regard a priest of any denomination as Mr. Winston Churchill regards a Bolshevik, and revile a church as a steeple house, has produced all the separatist sects, and has in our day invaded even the Church of England in the person of the most intellectually eminent of its dignitaries."¹⁶

And the next year's publication of *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism* includes a wide range of references to Quakers citing, at one point, Fox as one of "our English prophets."¹⁷ In reviewing the Factory Acts, he pauses to note, as exceptions, those employers "who had tender consciences or who, like some of the Quakers had a form of religion which compelled them to think sometimes of what they were doing by throwing all the responsibility for it on themselves and not on any outside authority. . . ."¹⁸

In dealing with liberty of conscience in the same work, he refers to the early Quakers and their plight under Charles II. Later, in a section called "Socialism and the Churches," in explaining how the Church can be a stronger force within the State than if it were an independent theocracy ruling the country directly, Shaw clearly reveals the respect in which he has come to hold the Society of Friends:

This power [that of a theocracy] was actually achieved by the Church of England; but it broke down because the English people would not remain in one Church. They broke away from the Church of England in all directions, and formed Free Churches. One of these, called the

¹⁵ Quoted in Raymond Mander and Joe Mitchenson, *Theatrical Companion to G. B. Shaw* (New York: Pitman, 1955), p. 207.

¹⁶ *Pen Portraits and Reviews* (London: Constable, 1932), p. 6.

¹⁷ *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism* (New York: Brentano's, 1928), p. 5.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 190.

Society of Friends (popularly called Quakers), carried its repudiation of Church of England ecclesiasticism to the length of denouncing priests as impostors, set prayer as an insult to God ("addressing God in another man's words"), and church buildings as "steeple houses"; yet this body, by sheer force of character, came out of a savage persecution the most respected and politically influential of religious forces in the country.¹⁹

In his postscript to *The Adventures of the Black Girl in Her Search for God*, speaking of the clash of religion and science over the status of the Bible (1932), he says he has "repeatedly warned the scientists that the Quakers are far more scientific than the official biologists."²⁰

He takes pains in his essay "On Days of Judgment" (the preface to *The Simpleton of the Unexpected Isles*, 1935) to explain how the heretic in present-day Russia is much like Fox in seventeenth-century England. That is, "he is not content with a quiet abstract dissent from the State religion of Soviet Russia: he is an active, violent, venomous saboteur. . . ."²¹

As a final disconnected example, in *Everybody's Political What's What*, published in 1944 when Shaw was eighty-eight, he explains how progress must always struggle against the status quo:

All progress means change of opinion; and new opinions often appear first as jokes and fancies, then as blasphemies and treasons, then as questions open to discussion, and finally as established truths. In England and America respectable women used to be publicly flogged for joining the Society of Friends (becoming Quakeresses); yet now membership in that body is regarded as promising a high degree of intelligence and probity.²²

Lest Friends turn too vain, I should add that his next example of this kind of progress is, again, the acceptance of Bolshevism.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 435.

²⁰ *The Adventures of the Black Girl in Her Search for God* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1933), p. 63.

²¹ *The Simpleton, The Six and The Millionairess* (London: Constable, 1936), p. 9.

²² *Everybody's Political What's What* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1944), p. 150.

2

Evidence would seem to indicate that Shaw, having been introduced to Quakerism by his affinity for the stubbornness of the conscientious objector in 1914, was moved to read Fox's *Journal*. This might almost be assumed to be a predestined meeting across the years. Shaw was always interested in heretics *per se*, but the case of George Fox was bound to hold a special fascination for him. The two actually had much in common, however much they may seem to differ superficially.

Fox, it must be remembered, set out, single-handed and divinely inspired, to oppose traditional Protestantism and ecclesiasticism, to restore the voice of God to the individual, to revive prophecy, to set up his life and behavior as a testimony to the Inner Light. Except that Shaw made use of a highly polished brand of literary and dramatic communication instead of Fox's direct, personal, unliterary verbal assault, and except that he was master (and victim) of a humorously detached point of view as opposed to Fox's intensely personal and humorless one, they might be said to have had the same mission.

We have seen that he occasionally referred obliquely to Fox in his later writings (and always with an air of genuine respect); in fact, he made the mistake of regarding Fox as the *typical* Quaker whereas most of us would, I think, regard him as not at all typical of the sect he founded. Such other symbols of Quakerism as William Penn, Elizabeth Fry, John Woolman, and Rufus Jones (to mention only the briefest roster) did not, apparently, contribute anything to Shaw's notion of what a Quaker is like. Fox, for him, is the Quaker, *par excellence*.

We have seen that he regarded his beloved Joan as something of a Quaker, and in 1936 (in a blistering retort against the Hays Organization's censorship of a proposed Hollywood film of Joan) he held her up to the measuring rod of George Fox: "In this heresy she was adamant: no threat of torture, no argument, no affectionate appeal to her feelings could move her from it: George Fox himself could not have taken the Quaker position with more heroic obstinacy."²³

²³ "St. Joan Banned; Film Censorship in the United States," *The London Mercury*, October, 1936.

So we can hardly be surprised to learn that he had thought of Fox too as the possible subject for a play. His biographer, Hesketh Pearson, reports: "The increasingly chaotic state of the world seems to be reflected in his later work. But in historical plays he escaped from the chaos He told me that he had wanted to write a play on George Fox, religion again being the main theme."²⁴ We may regret that this actual play never materialized, but out of this idea a play did come and with George Fox in it. However, now in his eighty-third year, Shaw decided, perhaps with a sense of haste, to include a number of other favorites of his from the latter seventeenth century and to combine them into an imagined page of history, *In Good King Charles' Golden Days*. "Charles might have met that human prodigy, Isaac Newton," Shaw explains in his preface. "And Newton might have met that prodigy of another sort, George Fox, the founder of the morally mighty Society of Friends, vulgarly called the Quakers."²⁵

The play is unorthodox in structure, even for Shaw, but it is rare intellectual entertainment and still awaits an adequate presentation professionally in the United States. The main body of the discourse is the long first act in which the rooms of Isaac Newton are invaded not only by Charles II and Fox but by the painter, Godfrey Kneller, three of Charles' mistresses, young James (who is to be James II), and others. The brief second (concluding) act is more a pleasant epilogue between Charles and his Queen, Catherine of Braganza.

The picture of Fox that we see in this play may not agree with our preconceived notions, but it is certainly a recognizable portrait. We must concede first of all that we find Fox historically out of his element. Although he was not afraid to carry his message to the great and near-great, we do not normally picture him ringed round with figures of the court and "society." Furthermore, he has here something of the flamboyant comic-opera quality—as do the other characters as well—for this is the style of the play. But once we have adjusted our reception to these artistic premises,

²⁴ GBS, *A Full-Length Portrait* (New York and London: Harper & Bros., 1942), p. 357.

²⁵ Preface to *In Good King Charles' Golden Days* in *Geneva, Cymbeline, and Good King Charles* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1947), p. 153.

Fox's words and behavior become acceptable for the founder of "the great Cult of Friendship."

The time of the play is 1680—Fox is fifty-six. He rejects the title of Mister for himself, but allows himself to be called Pastor. He says, "I am not one of those priestridden churchmen who believe God went out of business six thousand years ago when he had called the world into existence and written a book about it. We three sitting here together may have a revelation if we open our hearts and minds to it."²⁶ At one point the sound of a church bell sends him into an hysterical rage—over-theatrical, perhaps, but correctly illustrative of his attitude toward the "steeple houses."

Shaw had always been fascinated by the fact that the great scientific mind of Isaac Newton had been occupied seriously with making a chronology of the Bible similar to that of Bishop Ussher (a more impressive intellectual feat, Shaw noted, than his law of gravitation), and that it was this work for which he most hoped to be remembered. Newton finds no sympathy from Fox in this occupation: "The Lord does not love men that count numbers," says the Quaker. "Read Second Samuel, chapter twenty-four."²⁷ When Newton tries to place the beginning of the universe at the year 4004 B.C., Fox admonishes him: "Are ten million years beyond the competence of Almighty God? They are but a moment in His eyes. Four thousand years seem an eternity to a mayfly, or a mouse, or a mitred fool called an archbishop. Are we mayflies? Are we mice? Are we archbishops?"²⁸

But one of the characteristics of Shaw's plays is that all of his characters find themselves challenged in such a way that they have an opportunity to learn something if they will. And even George Fox is no exception. He finds himself forced to treat the scandalous Nell Gwynn as a "friend" and child of God. And he is further upset by the King (whom he addresses simply as Charles Stuart) when the suggestion is made that a playhouse, being a place where two or three are gathered together, might be as divine as Fox's meetinghouse. He must listen, too, to effete dramatic

²⁶ *Good King Charles*, p. 168.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 182.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

recitations from Dryden's *Aurengzebe*, which in turn precipitates a discussion on pleasure. Shaw has Fox say, perhaps for both of them, "It is not pleasure that makes life worth living. It is life that makes pleasure worth having. And what pleasure is better than the pleasure of holy living?"²⁹ But the most disturbing challenge to the founder of the Quakers in this brilliant company (about as brilliant, by the way, as one could imagine at any time or place) is the observation that there are large areas of revelation common to them all. "Things come to my knowledge by the grace of God," Fox notes, "yet the same things have come to you who live a most profane life and have no sign of grace at all."³⁰ And at one point Shaw manages impishly to have Fox "out-Quakered." It is the artist, Kneller, who implies that his hand while painting—while making profane objects of art—is as inspired as Fox's inner voices, that his hand is, in fact, the hand of God. When Fox is dumfounded by this, Kneller gives him the Quakerly reply: "And whose hand is it if not the hand of God?"³¹

Later, when young James quotes pessimistically from Dryden, "How vain is virtue . . ." etc., Fox takes no exception: "I have too good reason to know that it is true," he says. "But beware how you let these bold impious fellows extinguish hope in you. Their day is short; but the inner light is eternal."³² After more than an hour of provocative talk, Newton manages to get rid of his uninvited guests and the act closes. One senses that the portrait of Fox is not as complete as Shaw may have wished to make it. This certainly was not the play *about* Fox which he had in mind and the situation was not one which Fox had helped historically to create. In other words, he was not given the opportunity for development that Shaw earlier gave to Joan or Caesar or even, in a more limited sense, to Napoleon in *The Man of Destiny*. None of the characters in *Good King Charles* has such an opportunity. Theirs is rather the opportunity, which somehow they managed to miss in real life, simply of being challenged by those other brilliant minds of their contemporaries. In Shaw's hands

²⁹ Ibid., p. 205.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 215.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid., p. 203.

this is both entertaining and enlightening, but like any other work of art it must be accepted on its own terms, and there is no use blaming it for not being more than it sets out to be.

3

It would be pleasant for Friends to be able to record that all this pre-occupation with the Society and its founder had left discernible marks on Shaw's thinking. Although there are numerous areas in which Shaw's views and the traditional views of Friends come close enough at least to pose such a hypothesis, it must always be remembered, in dealing with Shaw, that his avid mind took what it could from wherever it could and made it his own.

Certainly he was a mystic—and certainly more consciously a mystic in his later years. To describe the nature of mysticism he used, quite often, the term "the inner light," for instance in his definition of Protestantism as "a movement towards the pursuit of a light called an inner light because every man must see it with his own eyes and not take any priest's word for it or any Church's account of it."³³ This brief passage also reveals a Quakerly disregard for hierarchy, and he once labeled both baptism and circumcision as "mere rites on which Jesus would not have wasted twenty words."³⁴ He spent a good deal of the long prefatory discourse already mentioned, "On the Prospects of Christianity," in an effort to divine the spirit of pre-Pauline or "primitive" Christianity. With the results of this effort not many Friends could wholly agree, but the direction would surely be a familiar one.

In the great intellectual-spiritual conflict set off in the late nineteenth century, his was one of the few rational voices that kept insisting on the divinity in science and evolution: "... we must warn our pupils against Natural Selection . . . [as] being clearly a corruption of the theory of evolution by extracting all the divinity from it, so that through it evolution gained the whole world, and lost its own soul."³⁵ His own work—like all worthy

³³ Preface to *Back to Methuselah* in *Selected Plays* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1948), II, lxxiv.

³⁴ Preface to *Androcles*, p. 913.

³⁵ *Doctors' Delusions, Crude Criminology, and Sham Education* (London: Constable, 1932), p. 367.

creative work—was in some unknown way divinely inspired, he claimed, and at ninety-two he was still insisting “. . . that the Holy Ghost is the sole survivor of the Trinity, and that it is far more scientific to describe Man as a Temple of the Holy Ghost than as an automaton in which some carbon got mixed accidentally. . . .”³⁶

Shaw extended his respect for the sanctity and dignity of life deeper into the animal kingdom than most Friends do. His vegetarianism and anti-vivisectionism, which some commentators put down as mere moral squeamishness, were more likely an expression of his own kind of reverence. “All life is human,” he had one of his favorite characters say, “and all humanity divine.”³⁷ Nevertheless his reverence took some twists that were not motivated by his studies of Fox or his interest in the wartime C.O.’s. He preferred, for instance, executions by the State to the cruelty of long imprisonment³⁸; and though he preached tolerance, those who seriously interfered with the practice of tolerance should be “liquidated.”³⁹

We have noted that Shaw sprang to the defense of the “conshies” in World War I, and he was sufficiently pacifistic in his writings during the course of that war to place himself in the position of a public enemy to many patriotic Britons. Yet, “. . . when war is once let loose, and it becomes a question of kill or be killed,” he thought, “there is no stopping to argue about it: one must just stand by one’s neighbors and take a hand with the rest. . . .”⁴⁰ By the time World War II threatened (in 1937) he seemed, however, willing to be more explicit: “If we want the war to stop, we must all become conscientious objectors.”⁴¹ He was even willing to accept the Sermon on the Mount and

³⁶ Preface to *Miraculous Birth of Language*, p. 19.

³⁷ *John Bull's Other Island* in *John Bull's Other Island, How He Lied to Her Husband, and Major Barbara* (London: Constable, 1931), p. 177.

³⁸ See *The Crime of Imprisonment* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1946).

³⁹ See “Short Wave Broadcast Delivered in 1937,” recorded on Heritage Record.

⁴⁰ *What I Really Wrote About the War*, p. 189.

⁴¹ See note 39.

behave *as though* he loved all men, provided the requirement *actually* to love them all was understood to be impossible!⁴²

During and after the later world conflict, Shaw, in his eighties, had less to say—or, perhaps more accurately, said less. But he could not keep completely silent. He labeled the dropping of the first atom bombs on Japanese cities “vivisectional amorality applied to ourselves more ruthlessly than to the dogs,” and could only conclude that “we can do nothing so far but tremble.”⁴³

Friends may well be grateful that Bernard Shaw always spoke of them with unusual respect and never turned on them the withering satire or downright invective that he was known to use on others; and that he was, in fact, a powerful spokesman on behalf of many of their testimonies. Yet, in spite of his interest, it is not known that he ever attended a meeting for worship or made any effort to follow the service activities of Friends, although both the British and American Service Committees originated from the same circumstances that enlisted his own primary attention to Quakerism. He was apparently satisfied to think of Friends as a composite of George Fox, a rather stereotyped image of a benevolent nineteenth-century factory owner, and a handful of his contemporaries—mostly conscientious objectors whom he did not know personally. The wonder is that such a composite image could elicit real admiration from so critical a mind.

Friends may justifiably regret, I think, that his search did not take him farther along the path on which he traveled for so good a pace in the company of Fox and the little band of Quakers who attracted him, to other areas of Friendly thought which need the peculiarly rational light of Shaw's genius.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ G. H. Bowker (ed.), *Shaw on Vivisection* (Chicago: Althea Publications, 1951), p. 23.

Historical News

Friends Historical Association

The Spring Meeting of Friends Historical Association was held at Stony Brook Meetinghouse, Princeton, New Jersey, on Fifth Month 19, 1956. It was a beautiful day for an excursion: some members stopped at Fallsington and Pennsbury en route, and many others took advantage of the special opportunity of visiting Nassau Hall and some of the historic houses in Princeton, including "Morven," the home of Richard Stockton, which was opened for the Association through the courtesy of Governor Robert B. Meyner. A special exhibit had been prepared in the Map Room of the Princeton University Library.

The new President of the Association, Thomas E. Drake, called the meeting to order in the old meetinghouse, and introduced Frank Aydelotte, who welcomed the Association to Princeton and introduced the speaker of the afternoon, Bruce H. French, who spoke on the history of Stony Brook Meeting and the Quaker associations of the Princeton region. The audience filled the meetinghouse. Attenders enjoyed a box lunch afterwards, with coffee and ice cream served by members of the meeting.

* * *

At its meeting on Fourth Month 5, 1956, the Board of Directors elected John L. Nickalls, Librarian of the Library of the Society of Friends, Friends House, London, an Honorary Member of Friends Historical Association. John Nickalls has been Editor of the *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* since 1933. He also edited the new and authoritative text of George Fox's *Journal* published by the Cambridge University Press in 1952.

* * *

The Annual Meeting of the Association in 1956 will be held at the Race Street Meetinghouse in Philadelphia. The Association is cooperating with the meeting in observing the hundredth anniversary of the erection of the meetinghouse.

Book Reviews

George Fox et les Quakers. By Henry van Etten. Paris: Editions du Seuil. 1956. 192 pages. \$2.00.

This little book is published in 10,000 copies as the fourth in a series called "*Mâîtres Spirituels*," a series which includes Mohammed, St. Augustine, and John the Baptist, a happily varied company of spiritual leaders. In the direct style known to us through his history of French Quakerism and numerous other writings on Quaker topics, the author presents here a succinct life of George Fox and the history of the Quaker movement. One of the special merits of this book is to show Quakerism in the context of the spiritual history of the period and to give large extracts from George Fox's *Journal* as well as from English, American, French, and German Quaker writings ranging in time from the early beginnings of Quakerism to the 1952 Friends World Conference. The historical developments of the Yearly Meetings around the world and also phases of Friends relief work are sketched, a fact which makes this 190-page booklet astonishingly comprehensive and thus a microcosm of Quakerdom.

An interesting chronology at the end of the book parallels important dates in Quaker history with events in France, bringing suddenly to one's full awareness, for instance, that Fox and Pascal were born only a year apart and that French Quakerism began shortly before the outbreak of the French Revolution. A bibliography of early and recent works in French shows that Quakerism has received attention from such minds as Voltaire and Diderot and in our days from some recognized Protestant theologians. With its seventy or more pictures obtained from treasure houses on two continents this is certainly the most profusely illustrated of Quaker books. Because of its attractive format and simple style it should be accessible to the Anglo-Saxon Friend with even a minimum knowledge of French. Quaker colleges and schools will want to own this George Fox in French garb as well as all individual Friends who see Quakerism as a world movement.

Pendle Hill

BLANCHE W. SHAFFER.

The Province of West Jersey, 1609-1702: A History of the Origins of an American Colony. By John E. Pomfret. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1956. xii, 298 pages. \$5.00.

The accident of a wide tidal river and the vagaries of royal grants and politics determined that there should be two Quaker "holy experiments" in the Delaware region rather than one. Here is the story of the

first one, West Jersey, first to be established and first to collapse. It is, as the title suggests, a study of West Jersey from the point of view of American history rather than Quaker history. But the Quakers so predominated among the proprietors and settlers of West Jersey that their principles, policies, and activities determined the early character of the province, and form the principal subject of this book.

The first chapters provide a convenient summary of the Dutch and Swedish period before the English conquest of 1664, and the decade of the Berkeley and Carteret proprietorship. But the story really begins in 1674 with the sale by Sir John Berkeley of his half interest in the whole province to John Fenwick, with whom was associated Edward Byllynge, both Quakers. This is the period on which John Pomfret, long a member of the history faculty at Princeton, sometime President of the College of William and Mary, and now Director of the Huntington Library in California, has done his most original work. In chapters on Fenwick and the founding of Salem, on the Concessions and Agreements of 1676, on early Burlington, on the collapse of the Quaker commonwealth, the disintegration of the proprietary, and the surrender of the colony to the Crown, Dr. Pomfret elucidates clearly and as definitively as it probably can ever be done, the tangled story of Fenwick and Byllynge's difficulties, of the Quaker proprietors and settlers, of the taking over of Byllynge's interest first by the non-Quaker proprietor, Dr. Daniel Coxe, and then by profit-seeking London businessmen of The West New Jersey Society, and of the merging of the colony with East Jersey under royal authority in 1702.

Further chapters tell something of the religious and social life of West Jersey Friends, of the divisive effects of the Keithian controversy in the 1690's, of the efforts of the Anglicans and Baptists to gain a foothold in this Quaker Eden, and of the ultimate fate of the Swedish Lutherans, sparsely settled on the west bank of the Delaware. These are all interesting, but, as I indicated above, the real contribution of the book lies in its detailed analysis of the story of the Quaker proprietorship.

The history of West New Jersey to 1702 suggests several generalizations about the process of colonization and government in colonial America. The West Jersey experience seems to confirm that the multiple proprietorship was one of the least viable means of founding and governing a colony with which the English experimented. Even when many of the proprietors and a majority of the settlers hoped to make the experiment a holy one, it would not work. Perhaps a holy experiment could never succeed except on the small scale and in the near political and economic vacuum, such as that which a few of the religious utopian communities of the nineteenth century managed temporarily to create for themselves.

Yet the New Jersey version of the Quaker experiment, like that of Pennsylvania, never wholly lost its impact. For it instilled ideals of democratic equality, of impartial justice, of regard for the rights of individuals

which have influenced New Jersey and American life through the three centuries since William Penn and the other Quaker trustees and proprietors first drew up and adopted their liberal Concessions and Agreements of 1676.

Haverford College

THOMAS E. DRAKE

Elbert Russell, Quaker: An Autobiography. Jackson, Tennessee: Friendly Press. 1956. vi, 376 pages. \$5.00.

The autobiography of Elbert Russell (1871-1951) is a valuable contribution to the history of modern Quakerism written by an important participant in the making of that history. It is also a lively and readable account of a very active life lived in a variety of places and circumstances. Beyond this it is a source of inspiration, portraying as it does with simplicity and directness a man who spared no effort or sacrifice in obeying almost constant calls to religious service.

The first draft of this book, covering Elbert Russell's life up to 1941, was edited by his wife and daughter. His son Josiah contributes a final chapter covering the last ten years. Had Elbert Russell lived to put the manuscript in final form, he probably would have omitted some detail, which, nevertheless, serves a purpose in portraying the life of his time.

The book begins with a graphic account of Elbert Russell's boyhood in Friendsville, Tennessee, followed by the story of eleven years spent with his grandparents in Indiana after the death of his parents. Life at Earlham, first as student and then as teacher of the Bible, occupied most of the next twenty-five years. Two years were then spent in Baltimore and seven in Swarthmore where he was director of the Woolman School. From 1926 to 1941 Elbert Russell served on the faculty of the Duke University School of Religion. For the last ten years of this period he was its dean. These main epochs were interspersed by frequent periods of study and travel. Most important were a sojourn of more than a year in Europe primarily to interpret the work of the American Friends Service Committee; a journey with a delegation to Central America in an effort to achieve peace there; three journeys to Europe to attend Ecumenical Conferences and a tour around the world during a sabbatical leave used largely to observe the impact of missionary work. The detailed accounts of these journeys include information and comments not easily found elsewhere.

Elbert Russell says that in writing his *History of Quakerism* he realized the debt owed by Quaker historians to the writers of Friends' journals. His own biography is intended to serve a similar purpose. This is fortunate as there are few recent Quaker journals. But Elbert Russell's autobiography, like those of Rufus M. Jones, Alfred C. Garrett, and other modern Friends, is more serviceable as a history of its period than are the spiritual autobiographies of earlier times, which are directly concerned only with the "dealings of the Lord" with the individual. Elbert

Russell enlivened his narrative with an account of his courtship and marriage, subjects barely mentioned in the older type of journal. To cite another difference, Elbert Russell's speaking engagements were responses to invitations, not solely occasioned by the inward movings of the Spirit. This gives a different tone to the book. However, it is important to recognize that the main decisions in Elbert Russell's life required much inward searching for Divine guidance.

One could wish for more comments on conditions in the Society of Friends. Elbert Russell took seriously the query: Do Friends have "a care for the reputation of others?" He accepts the pastoral system without criticism, but rebels at the more extreme forms of revivalism. On one occasion at Western Yearly Meeting when Esther Frame asked all those who wished to go to Heaven to stand up, he remained seated. Having been brought up in a form of Quakerism largely influenced by Methodism, he was at home in the Methodist Divinity School of Duke University. In his travels as preacher and lecturer he participated as fully in Methodist as in Quaker undertakings. In his speaking he avoided the more evangelical phrases, emphasizing what he called "the mystical and ethical aspects of Christianity." He was active in introducing liberal thought and the historical method in Biblical study among Quakers. For this reason he was sharply opposed by the evangelical party in the Middle West. His break with Earlham College was not, however, the result of his liberalism but of his opposition to what he considered to be a trend at Earlham away from Quakerism. It would be interesting to learn what he considered to be the qualifications of a truly Quaker college.

Though his experience was largely among pastoral Friends, Elbert Russell was genuinely attracted to the silent meeting of historic Quakerism. His first profound religious experience was in a silent meeting in Tennessee. For some time he convened a group of his students at Duke in a meeting on the basis of silence. The Durham Friends Meeting began in his home. When called to the directorship of the Woolman School in Swarthmore, he was aware of the difficulties he would face and the inevitable curtailment of his scholarly concentration, but he accepted the invitation because he wished to "improve religious knowledge among Friends and promote unity between the various branches." These were two of the main concerns of his life. Another was Biblical scholarship resulting in a number of books; still another was the cause of international peace. This inspired a large proportion of his public addresses.

Peace for Elbert Russell was not just an intellectual doctrine, it was a testimony to be lived. His friendly spirit, which shines through these pages, tended to disarm opposition. Of one particular incident he says: "I remembered the lesson which I learned in high school from boxing, that if you stay close to an opponent he cannot hit you very hard." As a writer Elbert Russell knows how to stay close to his readers.

Pendle Hill

HOWARD H. BRINTON

Briefer Notices

BY HENRY J. CADBURY

A lecture at Guilford College by Frances Renfrow Doak on Mary Mendenhall Hobbs has now been published by the college (18 pages, 1956). This distinguished North Carolina Quakeress (1852-1930) is attractively described and especially her interest in the education of women.

* * *

The *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* has put three hitherto unpublished documentary pieces of Quaker interest in one issue (Vol. 80 [April 1956]): a plan of Philadelphia, attempting to plot the original grants, though actually made in the 1740's (pp. 164-226); the missing evidence of the early settlement by the Dutch in Delaware before 1630, depositions on which Penn relied to establish his rights to that province (pp. 227-235); and a long letter of William Penn to Thomas Lloyd on public and private affairs (pp. 236-247). This last was ably edited by Frederick B. Tolles, the other two by Nicholas B. Wainwright.

* * *

Using a variety of materials including his own earlier articles on the Nicholites, Kenneth L. Carroll has written in *Delaware History*, 7 (1956), 37-48, on "Joseph Nichols of Delaware: An Eighteenth Century Religious Leader." Nichols (about 1730-1774) and his followers were like Friends in many respects. They organized soon after his death and later were mostly merged with Friends.

* * *

John E. Pomfret writes, in a manner parallel to his studies of early New Jersey, an account of the "First Purchasers of Pennsylvania" in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 80 (1956), 137-163. He deals at length with the persecutions of Friends in England as a motive for the Holy Experiment, and with the expense to Penn himself at which the early development of the settlement was secured.

* * *

In the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 64 (1956), 180-207, Richard L. Morton prints an account written by a Philadelphia girl of Quaker background of her work at Fort Magruder in the winters of 1865-66, 1866-67, and 1867-68 under the Friends Association of Philadelphia for the Relief of the Colored Freedmen. It is entitled "Life in Virginia by a 'Yankee teacher,' Margaret Newbold Thorpe," and is

a compilation she made later from her letters (now lost). It is particularly rich in detail about the folk she worked with. The later part of the same journal for the years 1869-70 and 1870-71 was edited for the *North Carolina Historical Review*, 30 (1953), 564-82, by the same editor under the title "A Yankee Teacher in North Carolina."

* * *

In the Tercentenary Supplement to the *Jewish Chronicle* for January 27, 1956, David Carrington has written on "Quakers and Jews" especially in the seventeenth century. The illustrations are from Quaker pamphlets to the Jews. The article may be compared with or supplemented by one in this BULLETIN, 29 (1940), 97-106, and another in *Children of Light* (ed. by Howard H. Brinton, 1938), 135-63.

* * *

A sixty-page pamphlet without imprint entitled *Sudbury Quakers, 1655-1953* consists of brief extracts, partly from standard Quaker history books and partly from the local Sudbury meeting books in manuscript and those of the nearby Bury and Colchester Monthly Meetings. These are arranged to show the interrelation of local Quaker history and the wider movement in and outside of the Society. They were collated by Stanley H. G. Fitch.

* * *

Historical Sketches of Crosswicks and Neighborhood by George De Cou (n. p. 1955, 19 pages) has been issued five years after the author's death. This area was settled by Friends, and the Quaker interest is fully described, including the meetings and meetinghouses of Chesterfield and Bordentown.

* * *

Hovert D. Ragland writes in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, 33 (1955), 169-182, on "Missions of the Society of Friends among the Indian Tribes of the Sac and Fox Agency." The story begins with the initiation of the Quaker superintendency in 1869 under President Grant and continues to the present, except where the Quaker work was discontinued. It includes the Shawnee, Iowa, and Kickapoo Missions and the establishment of several meetings composed of Quaker Indians.

* * *

Notice may still be in order of Thomas Eddy's *Hints for Introducing an Improved Mode of Treating the Insane in the Asylum*. This discussion, based on independent judgment as well as on reading the account of the York Retreat, is here reprinted in facsimile (White Plains, New York, 1951) from what is believed to be a unique survivor of the original edition of fifty copies in 1815. It was previously reprinted in 1916. As the minutes printed with it show, it led at once to purchase of thirty-eight acres of land and the erection of a special institution.

Ruth Marie Faurot publishes in *Notes and Queries*, New Series, 3 (1956), 17, "A 1682 Presentment of Quakers" which is unusual in that the presenter (the curate of Middleton, Yorkshire) insists that his own guilt be presented first.

* * *

Helen Wood Shortlidge is the author of *A History of the Little Britain Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, 1804-1954* (15 pages), an address presented at the Sesqui-Centennial Celebration in August 1954. Relying on the minutes mainly of the men's meeting, it relates the development of the older or constituent meetings (Penn Hill, Eastland, Drumore, East Britain), meetinghouses, schools, marriages, removals, personalities.

* * *

Edith M. Fox, Cornell University archivist, reports in *Cornell Alumni News*, 58 (1956), 369-370, "A Search for Founder's Birthplace." Following a series of clues and searching still for others, she concludes that Elijah and Eunice (Barnard) Cornell, the Quaker couple to whom Ezra Cornell was born in 1807, were living at the time in the house of Ezra Cornell, Elijah's brother, in Westchester Village, New York. That house, now torn down, was on Williamsbridge Road. An old photograph of the street and a map illustrate the article.

* * *

The botanist John Bartram made a journey to Pittsburgh, along its rivers and home via Virginia in the autumn of 1761. The journal he wrote about it is not preserved but some data are collected by Francis D. West in *The Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine*, 38 (1955), 111-115. Under the title "John Bartram's Journey to Pittsburgh in the Fall of 1761," he quotes from letters to and from Bartram and especially from the journal of another Quaker, James Kenny, who accompanied Bartram for the first ten days of his journey when he left Fort Pitt.

* * *

The life and Quaker ancestry of a remarkable learned lady, "the first translator of the *Saxon Chronicles* into English," will be found described by G. N. Garmonsway's article "Anna Gurney: Learned Saxonist" in *Essays and Studies* (1955), 40-57, published by The English Association at Oxford, England.

* * *

It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance for a revised understanding of Puritan-Quaker relations in early Massachusetts of an article by James F. Maclear in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 42 (1956), 621-652. Its thesis is that the very Puritans who persecuted the Quakers in the 1650's and later had themselves not long before shared the spirit-mysticism and other features of the radical Puritans. The article is called " 'The Heart of New England Rent': The Mystical Element in Early Puritan History."

Articles In Quaker Periodicals

BY LYMAN W. RILEY

Friends Journal

Royal F. Shepard, Jr., gives a brief interpretation of the eleventh chapter of Robert Barclay's *Apology*, calling it "A Forgotten Classic of Devotion."—Feb. 4, 1956, pp. 68-69.

"The Brinton Country," by Howard H. Brinton contains his remarks at the dedication of the 1704 Brinton House in Delaware County, Pa., built by William Brinton, first of many Brintons of the area.—Feb. 11, 1956, pp. 84-86.

Letter from the Past No. 156 is called "How Old Was Hannah?" The records of Bristol Monthly Meeting show the birth of two Hannah Callowhills, one born 1664, the other 1671; "Now and Then" concludes that it was probably the latter who married William Penn.—April 21, 1956, pp. 245-246.

Letter from the Past No. 157 is devoted to "The Quakerishness of Benjamin Franklin"; it mentions Franklin's Nantucket Quaker ancestor and discusses with appreciation his moral earnestness which was perhaps influenced by Quakerism.—June 9, 1956, pp. 359-360.

The Friends' Quarterly

An interesting sketch of the life and work of "George Edmondson (1798-1863)," Quaker schoolmaster, deals principally with his experiments in combining training for practical pursuits with academic studies. At Queenwood College, which he acquired from Robert Owen, he pioneered in the laboratory method of teaching science.—Jan., 1956, pp. 24-29.

"An Appreciation of Friends' Work in Madagascar" is an excerpt from a book on the island written in 1877 by the Reverend Lars Dahle of the Norwegian Missionary Society. It is here translated by Kari Mason. A typical quotation is: "The Quakers are furthest from us on theological grounds [but] they are nearest of all to us as fellow men."—April, 1956, pp. 61-64.

The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society

An editorial note describes in some detail thirty unrecorded letters written by Thomas Story to his wife Ann from 1702 to 1709.—45 (1953), 95-97.

William H. Marwick, in "Friends in Nineteenth Century Scotland," contributes much information, especially about individual Friends. He

discusses the organization of the General Meeting, travelling ministers, and Friends in industry and public life, and sketches the history of several local meetings.—46 (1954), 3-18.

John Sturge Stephens writes an interesting appreciation of "Nathaniel Morgan of Ross," (1775-1854), an active and progressive Friend, pacifist, and social reformer.—46 (1954), 19-27.

Henry J. Cadbury's note, "Ex Libris Margaret Fox," describes a volume of Quaker pamphlets belonging successively to Margaret Fox, John Abraham, Elizabeth Shipley, Nicholas Waln, Roberts Vaux, and the Library Company of Philadelphia.—46 (1954), 28-29.

"Two German Views on Quakers" are published by W. D. Robson-Scott, one by Ferdinand Albrecht, Duke of Brunswick, who gives a general account of Quaker worship and belief, the other by Christlob Mylius who describes a visit to the meeting in Gracechurch Street, London.—46 (1954), 30-32.

Marek Waysblum translates a brief but discerning eye-witness account of "Elizabeth Fry at Newgate, 1820," written by Charles Sienkiewicz, a Polish visitor to England.—46 (1954), 33-34.

"A Spanish Officer among the Quakers" was Francisco de Miranda, a Venezuelan who toured the United States in 1783-1784. These excerpts from his diary tell of meeting Quakers in North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island; he attended meetings for worship in Philadelphia and Newport.—46 (1954), 35-37.

John Hodgson, Quaker author of a pamphlet against the Protectorate, may have later enlisted in the army in the interest of political order. Alan Cole discusses this possibility in an article called "The Peace Testimony in 1659."—46 (1954), 48-52.

Ruth G. Burt tells of the development of "The Quaker Marriage Declaration" which is, with minor changes, that of the Puritans published by direction of the Long Parliament in 1645.—46 (1954), 53-59.

In "George Keith to Henry More" Henry J. Cadbury publishes, with an extensive note, a letter in which Keith disclaims responsibility for the rumor prevalent at the University of Aberdeen that More had turned Quaker.—46 (1954), 59-63.

A note on "Penn and His Printer" tells of a Public Record Office document referring to the imprisonment of John Darby, printer of *The Sandy Foundation Shaken*.—46 (1954), 64-65.

"Friends and the Slave Trade" includes an unusual item—an election declaration by three Yorkshire Friends urging the election to Parliament of William Wilberforce.—46 (1954), 65-66.

"The Baptism of Maria Hack, 1837" is described in her own letter to her son. She was a convert of Isaac Crewdson, a former Quaker minister who taught the necessity of outward baptism.—46 (1954), 67-77.

GENERAL INDEX

TO

Bulletin of

Friends Historical Association

VOLUMES XLI-XLV

1952-1956

